

THE REFERENCE SHELF

is published to make available when needed good debates, collections of articles, briefs, bibliographies and study outlines on timely subjects for public discussion. Each number is devoted to a single subject and, unless otherwise noted, contains briefs, references and selected articles. To make the material available at the time of greatest need, publication is irregular. Each volume contains ten or more separate issues, about 1500 pages in all, and covers about a year in time. Single numbers, 90c unless otherwise noted.

Volume II. \$2.40

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>No.</p> <p>4. French Occupation of the Ruhr: (Oxford-Bates debate, with briefs, references and reprints)</p> <p>7. Soldiers' Bonus. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>9. Superpower. L. T. Beman.</p> | <p>No.</p> <p>10. Recognition of Soviet Russia. J. G. Hodgson.
<i>See also University Debaters' Annual, 1923-24; 1930-31; 1931-32; Recognition of Russia.</i></p> |
|--|---|
- Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8 are out of print.

Volume III. \$5.40

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>No.</p> <p>1. Tax-Exempt Securities. L. T. Beman.</p> <p>2. A Labor Party for the United States. J. G. Hodgson.</p> <p>3. Single Six-Year Term for President. E. M. Phelps.</p> <p>4. Japanese Exclusion. J. E. Johnsen.
<i>See also University Debaters' Annual, 1924-25. p. 75-119.</i></p> <p>5. Proportional Representation. L. T. Beman.</p> | <p>No.</p> <p>6. Academic Freedom. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>7. Abolishment of Electoral College. L. T. Beman.</p> <p>8. Metric System. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>9. Child Labor. J. E. Johnsen. o.p.
<i>See also Handbook, University Debaters' Annual, 1924-25. p. 367-414 and University Debaters' Annual, 1925-26. p. 341-95.</i></p> <p>10. Outlawing the Pistol. L. T. Beman.</p> |
|--|---|

Volume IV. \$4.80

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>No.</p> <p>1. Government Regulation of the Coal Industry. J. E. Johnsen.
<i>See also University Debaters' Annual, 1925-26. p. 51-93.</i></p> <p>2. Election vs. Appointment of Judges. L. T. Beman.</p> | <p>No.</p> <p>3. Military Training Compulsory in Schools and Colleges. Out of print.</p> <p>4. St. Lawrence River Ship Canal. J. E. Johnsen.</p> |
|--|--|

THE REFERENCE SHELF: (Continued)

No.

5. Federal Department of Education.
J. E. Johnsen
See also Handbook, Ser. II, Vol.
2 and University Debaters' An-
nual, 1925-26. p. 95-142.

No.

6. Farm Relief. L. T. Beman. \$1.25.
See also Reference Shelf Vol. 3;
No. 4 and University Debaters'
Annual, 1926. Ch. I.

7. Liberty. E. M. Phelps. \$1.25.
See University Debaters' An-
nual, 1925-26. p. 413-93.

ness of the Hour. (Study
no.) New edition. J. E.
Johnsen.

System. J. E. Johnsen.
See University Debaters' An-
nual, 1927-28. Ch. IX and 1928-
Ch. VII.

Control. L. T. Beman.

Monopoly Buying. H. M. Mul-
See University Debaters' An-
nual, 1928-29. Ch. IV.

and State Control of
Power. Out of print.
See University Debaters' An-
nual, 1928-29 and Reference
shelf. Vol. II. No. 9.

Form of Government.
Out of print.
See University Debaters' An-
nual, 1924-25. p. 1-74.

Unemployment Fund for Unemploy-
ment. H. M. Muller.
Out of print.

Libraries. J. E. Johnsen.
Manager Government.
H. Muller.

Trade. J. E. Johnsen.
Unit of School Adminis-
tration. W. G. Carr.

2. Stability of Employment. J. E.
Johnsen.

3. Lobbying in Congress. H. M.
Muller.

4. Trends in University Education.
J. G. Hodgson.

5. Consumption of Wealth in Time
of War. J. E. Johnsen.

Insurance Unemployment Insur-
ance. E. C. Buehler.

7. Chain Stores. Daniel Bloomfield.

8. The World Court. H. M. Muller.

9. Planning for Economic Stability.
J. G. Hodgson.

10. Capitalism on Trial. J. E. John-
sen.

THE REFERENCE SHELF (Continued)

Volume VIII. \$6

1. Education by Radio. H. M. Muller.
2. State and Local Tax Revision. E. C. Buehler.
3. State and Local Tax Revision: Analytical Survey. E. C. Buehler.
4. Cancellation of International War Debts. J. G. Hodgson.
5. Debate Index. E. M. Phelps.
6. Federal Regulation of Banking; With Guaranty of Deposits. J. G. Hodgson.
7. Stabilization of Money. J. G. Hodgson.
8. Chinese-Japanese War. J. E. Johnsen.
9. Federal Regulation of Motor Transport. H. M. Muller.
10. American vs. British System of Radio Control. E. C. Buehler.

Volume IX. \$3.60

1. Economic Nationalism. J. G. Hodgson.
2. Out of print.
3. Federal Aid to Education. J. E. Johnsen.
4. Wall Street: Asset or Liability? J. G. Hodgson.
5. Out of print.
6. Contest Debating. H. B. Summers.
7. Out of print.
8. Federal Aid for Equalizing Educational Opportunity. H. M. Muller.
9. Out of print.
10. Democratic Collectivism. H. M. Muller.

Volume X. \$4.80

1. Collective Bargaining. J. E. Johnsen.
2. Lotteries. H. M. Muller.
3. Old Age Pensions. J. E. Johnsen.
4. Out of print.
5. Socialization of Medicine. J. E. Johnsen.
6. Limitation of Power of Supreme Court to Declare Acts of Congress Unconstitutional. J. E. Johnsen.
7. The Neutrality Policy of the United States. Out of print.
8. Freedom of Speech. J. E. Johnsen.
9. Government Ownership of Electric Utilities. J. E. Johnsen.
10. The Crisis in the Electric Utilities. Garland and Phillips.

Volume XI. \$6

1. Unicameral Legislatures. H. B. Summers.
2. Consumers' Cooperatives. J. E. Johnsen, J. V. Garland, C. F. Phillips.
3. Industrial versus Craft Unionism. J. E. Johnsen.
4. Reorganization of the Supreme Court. J. E. Johnsen.
5. Unicameralism in Practice: The Nebraska Legislative System. H. B. Summers.
6. Modern Group Discussion. L. and E. Judson.
7. Arbitration and the National Labor Relations Board. E. R. Nichols and J. W. Logan.
8. Chinese-Japanese War, 1937-. J. E. Johnsen.
9. Peace and Rearmament. J. E. Johnsen.
10. Representative American Speeches. A. C. Baird. \$1.25.

Volume XII. \$6

1. Anglo-American Agreement. H. B. Summers. \$1.25.

Future Issues to be Announced

The Reference Shelf is entered in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Education Index, Industrial Arts Index, Cumulative Book Index, and Book Review Digest.

PERIODICALS

containing articles not available in your local library can be had from our PERIODICALS DEPARTMENT at reasonable prices.

Ask for descriptive circular and prices.

THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY

950 University Avenue

New York City

THE REFERENCE SHELF

Vol. 11

No. 10

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES: 1937-1938

SELECTED BY

A. CRAIG BAIRD

Department of Speech, University of Iowa



NEW YORK

THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY

1938

Copyright 1938
by The H. W. Wilson Company
Published August 1938
Printed in the United States of America

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES

Prefatory Note

Representative American Speeches, 1937-38, is based upon the assumption that a speech is the product of (1) a speaker, presenting, (2) a given subject, before (3) an audience, on (4) a specific occasion. The effective speech, then, is the outcome not of any one of these elements but of the combination.

More specifically, the superior speech has at least ten characteristics. (1) *It has significant ideas.* Great speeches spring from great crises and from important problems and themes. The addresses in this volume deal with foreign policy, court reorganization, freedom of press, crime control, economic reconstruction, and educational and religious programs. The address should also reflect a mature philosophy.

(2) *The subject is fully analyzed.* The author of the speech penetrates his subject, states and interprets the important issues. He surveys his problem with unusual insight.

(3) *The speech is well-organized.* This organization may not be obvious or skeletonic. Nevertheless the organic structure is clear, not only in the approach, main body, and outcome or conclusion, but in the sub-structure of paragraphs. The unfolding process, with its unity, progression, and order, should interest and satisfy the listener.

(4) *The forms of support are abundant and persuasive.* The supporting data, or evidence, should be internally consistent and otherwise acceptable to the audience. The modes of proof—causal reasoning, specific instance, statistics, illustrations, analogies, and authorities—should meet the tests of logical validity.

4 REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES

(5) *The oral language is efficient and persuasive.* The speech style should be that of the platform rather than that of literary composition. The language should be unhackneyed, clear, concrete, vivid, at times figurative. Sentence-structure should suit the mood of the talk; it should be varied, lively, rhythmical.

(6) *The speech appeals to the audience thru motivating materials.* The effective speaker analyzes his audience as well as his theme. He understands the beliefs, drives, interests, and attitudes, of his hearers. His address is permeated with emotional appeals; it utilizes such incentives to action as love of country, duty, ambition, profit, justice, and tradition.

(7) *The effective speaker has audience projection.* Whether he reads, memorizes, or extemporizes, he nevertheless thru voice and manner controls his audience, and impresses them thru his speaking leadership.

(8) *The effective speaker uses his voice well.* He enunciates clearly and pronounces according to an acceptable standard. He has a wide range of pitch and a pleasing pitch level. He can control intensity and rate of utterance. The quality of his voice is pleasing. His presentation is conversational and lively. In short, his voice is the sensitive, active instrument of an active mind.

(9) *The effective speaker has good control of his bodily mechanism.* His gestures and movements are purposeful; on the platform he is "magnetic."

(10) *The effective speaker has an appealing personality.* In his speeches, he evidences self-control, sincerity, tact, humor (when needed), altruism, and idealism. He proves himself a "good man" in the Aristotelian-Ciceronian sense.

These combined criteria have been applied to the speeches of this book. If such tests are rigidly imposed, it is obvious that few speakers of the hour will stand the scrutiny. Altho the delivery may be excellent, mediocrity may stamp the thinking. If ideas are excellent, details may be badly expressed; the reasoning may be fallacious, the style may be literary rather than oral. Even though the subject-matter and

composition rate high, the speaker may have a nasal or muffled quality of voice; he may drawl, or "orate," or resort to bodily contortions. The superior speech should be exempt from these faults of matter and manner.

Two or three additional limitations have governed the author in his selection of these American speech-makers. (1) *The talks are those delivered in the United States.* At once we exclude Hitler, Mussolini, Eden, and others who have moved millions in recent months. (2) *The speeches have been composed by those who have delivered them.* In these days of ghost writers and busy speakers, it is well-known that obliging subordinates and colleagues furnish ready-made remarks to the performer. Critics of speeches must judge as best they can the extent to which the production represents the thinking and craftsmanship of the alleged creator. (3) *The speeches are restricted to those delivered between February 1, 1937, and June 1, 1938.* Some orators of national prominence are not listed here largely because during this period they appeared with relative infrequency on speaking programs. (4) *The addresses represent different types of speaking occasions, (a) forensic, (b) legislative or deliberative, (c) pulpit, (d) demonstrative and ceremonial (including business, dinner speaking, educational), and (e) radio.* This classification is of course not strictly logical. To include examples of these typical occasions and yet to limit the total representation to twenty speeches—this procedure has meant the rejection of a number of worthy talks and orations in each group. If some favorite orator, familiar to you for a number of years, is absent, one or another of the reasons listed above may account for such omission.

Are these twenty selections the "best speeches of the year"? The author makes no claim that they are. It is hoped, however, that they are representative of the kind and quality of speaking done in this country during the period specified. If the specimens here assembled may seem in passages dull; if the political philosophy of Edmund Burke's debates seems robust by comparison; if the logic seems less

6 REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES

compact and astute than that of Thomas Erskine, the English advocate; if the delivery, as we strive to recall it, of these Americans of the present hour seems, except in a few cases, less ardent or less conversational than that which we are assured Wendell Phillips exhibited; nevertheless these twenty specimens are assumed to be a fair cross-section of American oratory of the moment.

What of the excellence of these talks of 1937-38 as compared with those of earlier America—for example, of the period of 1830-60? Certainly interest in speech-making in America, partly because of the radio, is high. General training in speech is more and more permeating the rank-and-file. The general product is by no means inferior. If at the top of the achievement scale profound oratory is missing, it may be due to the fact that despite our latest business recession, we Americans have had no international, economic, or religious crises cataclysmic enough to give to our prophets tongues of eloquence.

Furthermore, our American civilization since 1900, with its materialistic urge, its mass education that has more and more dominated the curriculum even of higher learning, its profound shifts between 1914 and 1929, may explain the vicissitudes and some of the drabness of our platform artistry. Our American speaking is utilitarian rather than artistic. Public speaking in a democracy, like literature and other art forms, mirrors the social movements and the spiritual mores of the times.

The present compiler disavows sponsorship for the views of these orators. This book is a collection of speeches and not a document aimed to promote a given political or social attitude.

It is designed for students of speech on the secondary school and college levels, especially debaters, extempore speakers, orators, and interpretative readers; for students of history and contemporary American civilization; and for members of courses in oral and written composition.

To the authors of the addresses the editor expresses his gratitude for permission to publish the material and for co-operation in securing authentic texts.

The editor is deeply grateful to the numerous colleagues in speech and other fields who in conference or by mail have tendered helpful criticisms concerning the selections in this book. Special thanks are due to Orvin Larson of the Speech Department at the University of Iowa, who prepared the biographical notes and otherwise assisted in the preparation of the book.

A. CRAIG BAIRD

June 1, 1938

CONTENTS

Prefatory Note	3
Second Inaugural Address. Franklin Delano Roosevelt	11
Anti-Lynching Bill. William E. Borah	17
Memorial Day Address. A. H. Vandenberg	39
No Democracy Without Civil Liberty. Norman Thomas	45
What Does the European Situation Mean to Us?—A De- bate. Gerald P. Nye and Dorothy Thompson	52
America's Foreign Policy. Robert LaFollette	69
The Protection of Democracy. Herbert Hoover	80
Germany Takes Austria. Boake Carter	97
Victory Dinner Address. Franklin Delano Roosevelt ..	101
The Spirit of the Reorganization Bill. Charles E. Coughlin	111
Rise of Personal Government in the United States. Walter Lippmann	122
Which Way is Progress? Nicholas Murray Butler	138
The Community of Interest Between Labor, Capital and Agriculture. Henry Wallace	146
The Inside Story of a Racket. Thomas E. Dewey	163
The Judiciary. Charles Evans Hughes	176
A Philosophy of Life. Robert M. Hutchins	184
The Science of Better Living. Owen D. Young	190
The Role of the Press as a Factor in Public Opinion and Economic Changes. Carl W. Ackerman	198
Being Civilized to Death. Harry Emerson Fosdick	210
BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	220
INDEX	226

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS¹

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

This inaugural address, delivered on January 20, 1937, was the first one to be given after the passage of the Norris Amendment to the Constitution, providing for the earlier induction of the President-elect into office. The speech was notable for its atmosphere of good will, its freedom from castigation and proposals of panaceas. Political observers, for example, had expected the President to advocate reorganization of the Supreme Court. But he gave a broad statement of the principles he intended to follow during the ensuing four years. The address was preceded by a parade through a raw January day. The President in the main portico of the Capitol bared his head in the chill, driving rain as he prepared to speak and to take the oath of office from Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes. Twice during the presentation of the speech did Roosevelt brush water from his face. The delivery in no way suffered because of these conditions. This demonstrative address may be contrasted with profit with Franklin Roosevelt's first, and with Lincoln's second, inaugural address.²

When four years ago we met to inaugurate a President, the Republic, single-minded in anxiety, stood in spirit here. We dedicated ourselves to the fulfillment of a vision—to speed the time when there would be for all the people that security and peace essential to the pursuit of happiness. We of the Republic pledged ourselves to drive from the temple of our ancient faith those who had profaned it; to end by action, tireless and unafraid, the stagnation and despair of that day.

We did those first things first.

Our covenant with ourselves did not stop there. Instinctively we recognized a deeper need—the need to find thru government the instrument of our united purpose to solve for the individual the ever-rising problems of a complex civilization. Repeated attempts at their solution without the

¹ By permission of the author.

² Note the biographical items in the Appendix concerning each speaker.

aid of government had left us baffled and bewildered. For without that aid we had been unable to create those moral controls over the services of science which are necessary to make science a useful servant instead of a ruthless master of mankind. To do this we knew that we must find practical controls over blind economic forces and blindly selfish men.

We of the republic sensed the truth that democratic government has innate capacity to protect its people against disasters once considered inevitable—to solve problems once considered unsolvable. We would not admit that we could not find a way to master economic epidemics just as, after centuries of fatalistic suffering, we had found a way to master epidemics of disease. We refused to leave the problems of our common welfare to be solved by the winds of chance and the hurricanes of disaster.

In this we Americans were discovering no wholly new truth; we were writing a new chapter in our book of self government.

This year marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the constitutional convention which made us a nation. At that convention our forefathers found the way out of the chaos which followed the revolutionary war; they created a strong government with powers of united action sufficient then and now to solve problems utterly beyond individual or local solution. A century and a half ago they established the Federal government in order to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to the American people.

Today we invoke those same powers of government to achieve the same objectives.

Four years of new experience have not belied our historic instinct. They hold out the clear hope that government within communities, government within the separate States, and government of the United States can do the things the times require, without yielding its democracy. Our task in the last four years did not force democracy to take a holiday.

Nearly all of us recognize that as intricacies of human relationships increase, so power to govern them also must

increase—power to stop evil; power to do good. The essential democracy of our nation and the safety of our people depend not upon the absence of power, but upon lodging it with those whom the people can change or continue at stated intervals thru an honest and free system of elections. The Constitution of 1787 did not make our democracy impotent.

In fact, in these last four years, we have made the exercise of all power more democratic; for we have begun to bring private autocratic powers into their proper subordination to the public's government. The legend that they were invincible—above and beyond the processes of a democracy—has been shattered. They have been challenged and beaten.

Our progress out of the depression is obvious.

But that is not all that you and I mean by the new order of things. Our pledge was not merely to do a patch-work job with second-hand materials. By using the new materials of social justice we have undertaken to erect on the old foundations a more enduring structure for the better use of future generations.

In that purpose we have been helped by achievements of mind and spirit. Old truths have been relearned; untruths have been unlearned. We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals; we know now that it is bad economics. Out of the collapse of a prosperity whose builders boasted their practicality has come the conviction that in the long run economic morality pays. We are beginning to wipe out the line that divides the practical from the ideal, and in so doing we are fashioning an instrument of unimagined power for the establishment of a morally better world.

This new understanding undermines the old admiration of worldly success as such. We are beginning to abandon our tolerance of the abuse of power by those who betray for profit the elementary decencies of life.

In this process evil things formerly accepted will not be so easily condoned. Hard-headedness will not so easily excuse hard-heartedness. We are moving toward an era of good

feeling. But we realize that there can be no era of good feeling save among men of good will.

For these reasons I am justified in believing that the greatest change we have witnessed has been the change in the moral climate of America.

Among men of good will, science and democracy together offer an ever-richer life and ever-larger satisfaction to the individual. With this change in our moral climate and our re-discovered ability to improve our economic order we have set our feet upon the road of enduring progress.

Shall we pause now and turn our back upon the road that lies ahead? Shall we call this the promised land? Or shall we continue on our way? For "each age is a dream that is dying, or one that is coming to birth."

Many voices are heard as we face a great decision. Comfort says, "Tarry a while." Opportunism says, "This is a good spot." Timidity asks, "How difficult is the road ahead?"

True, we have come far from the days of stagnation and despair. Vitality has been preserved. Courage and confidence have been restored. Mental and moral horizons have been extended.

But our present gains were won under the pressure of more than ordinary circumstance. Advance became imperative under the goad of fear and suffering. The times were on the side of progress.

To hold to progress today, however, is more difficult. Dulled conscience, irresponsibility, and ruthless self-interest already reappear. Such symptoms of prosperity may become portents of disaster. Prosperity already tests the persistence of our progressive purpose.

Let us ask again: Have we reached the goal of our vision of that 4th day of March, 1933? Have we found our happy valley?

I see a great nation, upon a great continent, blessed with a great wealth of natural resources. Its hundred and thirty million people are at peace among themselves; they are making their country a good neighbor among the nations. I see

a United States which can demonstrate that, under democratic methods of government, national wealth can be translated into a spreading volume of human comforts hitherto unknown—and the lowest standard of living can be raised far above the level of mere subsistence.

But here is the challenge to our democracy: In this nation I see tens of millions of its citizens—a substantial part of its whole population—who at this very moment are denied the greater part of what the very lowest standards of today call the necessities of life.

I see millions of families trying to live on incomes so meager that the pall of family disaster hangs over them day by day.

I see millions whose daily lives in city and on farm continue under conditions labeled indecent by a so-called polite society half a century ago.

I see millions denied education, recreation, and the opportunity to better their lot and the lot of their children.

I see millions lacking the means to buy the products of farm and factory and by their poverty denying work and productiveness to many other millions.

I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished.

It is not in despair that I paint you that picture. I paint it for you in hope—because the nation, seeing and understanding the injustice in it, proposes to paint it out. We are determined to make every American citizen the subject of this country's interest and concern, and we will never regard any faithful, law-abiding group within our borders as superfluous. The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

If I know aught of the spirit and purpose of our Nation we will not listen to comfort, opportunism, and timidity. We will carry on.

Overwhelmingly we of the Republic are men and women of good will—men and women who have cool heads and willing hands of practical purpose as well. They will insist

that every agency of popular government use effective instruments to carry out their will.

Government is competent when all who compose it work as trustees for the whole people. It can make constant progress when it keeps abreast of all the facts. It can obtain justified support and legitimate criticism when the people receive true information of all that government does.

If I know aught of the will of our people they will demand that these conditions of effective government shall be created and maintained. They will demand a nation uncorrupted by cancers of injustice and, therefore, strong among the nations in its example of the will of peace.

Today we reconsecrate our country to long-cherished ideals in a suddenly-changed civilization. In every land there are always at work forces that drive men apart and forces that draw men together. In our personal ambitions we are individualists. But in our seeking for economic and political progress as a nation, we all go up, or else we all go down, as one people.

To maintain a democracy of effort requires a vast amount of patience in dealing with differing methods, a vast amount of humility. But out of the confusion of many voices rises an understanding of dominant public need. Then political leadership can voice common ideals, and aid in their realization.

In taking again the oath of office as President of the United States, I assume the solemn obligation of leading the American people forward along the road over which they have chosen to advance.

While this duty rests upon me I shall do my utmost to speak their purpose and to do their will, seeking Divine guidance to help us each and every one to give light to them that sit in darkness and to guide our feet into the way of peace.

ANTI-LYNCHING BILL¹

WILLIAM E. BORAH

This speech was delivered in the United States Senate on January 7, 1938, in opposition to the Wagner-Van Nuys Anti-lynching Bill. Senator Borah's speech was not a part of the filibuster which the southern senators were conducting against the bill, but was essentially a clear-cut argument. Borah had long opposed this legislation as an invasion of states' rights. In this debate, the Senator went further and denounced the measure as a sectional one, directed against the South. The speech was one of Borah's ablest presentations. Senator Kenneth D. McKellar, of Tennessee, who followed Borah, said. "As a southern man to a northern man, as one American to another, I want to thank him for that speech, and I believe it to be one of the longest remembered speeches ever made in this body." The southern filibuster against the bill was successful.

Mr. President, this measure, in a slightly different form but embodying the same principles, came to this body about 25 years ago. At that time I was a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and was appointed by the late Senator Nelson chairman of a subcommittee to pass upon the measure, particularly its constitutional features. I shall not at this time go into the history of the action of the committee at that time. It may be necessary to do so later in order to throw light upon some features of this matter. It is sufficient now to say that I reached a conclusion as to the merits of the bill, which conclusion I still entertain.

Heretofore I have confined my remarks upon this bill largely to the question of its constitutionality. Those questions still interest me, and probably I shall discuss them later. Today, however, I desire to address my attention for a time to the policy involved in this measure. Assuming for the purpose of the argument that we have the constitutional power to pass such a measure as this, I desire to invite the attention

¹ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 85, no. 5, p. 186-91. January 7, 1938. By permission of the author.

of the Senate to the wisdom of doing so. I think it only a little less important, perhaps no less important, than the constitutional question itself.

Notwithstanding anything that has been said or that may be said to the contrary, this is a sectional measure. It is an attempt upon the part of states practically free from the race problem to sit in harsh judgment upon their sister states where the problem is always heavy and sometimes acute. It is proposed to condemn these states and the people in them because it is claimed that they have failed properly to meet and adjust this most difficult of all problems. No more drastic condemnation could be offered by a measure than that which is offered by the measure now before the Senate.

It proposes to authorize the national government to enter into the states, and to take charge of and prosecute as criminals the duly elected officials of the states, from the governor down. It proposes that the federal government shall be the sole judge of the guilt or innocence of state officials.

In my opinion that requires a review of some unfortunate history, and the recalling of some unpleasant facts. These states are not to be pilloried and condemned without a full presentation of the nature of the task which fate and circumstances imposed upon them, and not without a complete record as to the weight and difficulty of the task, what has been done, and with what good faith it has been met. I shall contend that the Southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history, dealing with a problem of similar nature. Let us inquire what it is that the South has had to do, how it has done it, and what reason there is now, after 70 years of great effort, to pass censure or condemnation of those great states and that great people.

Paraphrasing the language of one of the most eloquent of men, when the Confederate soldier pulled his gray cap over his brow, and lifted his pallid and tear-stained face for the

last time to the graves which dotted the hills of old Virginia, and started on his slow and painful journey home, what was he to find? What were the problems, what was the task, what were the conditions which confronted him? His home was destroyed, his plantation devastated, his help gone, his money worthless, his civilization imperiled. This was the condition in addition to the other problem with which we are more particularly concerned today, and which confronted the South as it entered upon its great task of rebuilding.

I shall not go into details as to the reconstruction period. I recall it sufficiently and only that we may understand something of the antecedents of this problem and something as to the good faith and the ability with which it has been met. I recall a single instance in the way of illustration. When Congress met in December 1865 the then leader of the House—perhaps the most complete master of the House of Representatives that history records—Thaddeus Stevens, outlined the program with reference to the then pending situation. Among other things, he said:

The future condition of the conquered power depends upon the will of the conqueror.

He said further that the conquered provinces were to be admitted as states—

Only when the Constitution has been amended so as to secure the perpetual ascendancy of the party of the Union—

The Republican Party.

Every government is a despotism. . . . The Constitution has nothing to do with it [the program]. . . . I propose to deal with you [the South] entirely by the laws of war. . . . The conquered people have no right to appeal to the courts to test the constitutionality of the law. The Constitution has nothing to do with them or they with it.

Thus they were to take up the work of rebuilding and of carrying the race problem with the threat of having all constitutional guaranties withdrawn.

Mr. President, I have always felt that in many respects the reconstruction period is the most regrettable page of

American history. Had Abraham Lincoln lived thru his second term it probably would have been the most readable page, one of the noblest pages in all history. It would have been characterized by wide sympathy, by breadth of understanding, and by the wisdom which flows from the heart as well as the brain, which passes all understanding. It would have been free from that blind partisanship which disregards constitutions and constitutional limitations as well as national honor and national unity.

A short time before the Great Emancipator was removed from the scene he had outlined his views on reconstruction. What a different story would have been written had those views prevailed! What a different national life would have been lived had those views obtained! But before his body had reached Springfield the committee had met and had determined upon the complete rejection of the entire policy theretofore announced by the dead President. Ben Butler's views superseded those of Abraham Lincoln; and a more tragic thing could not happen in a crisis confronting a nation. These measures with reference to reconstruction therefore were written from the standpoint of partisanship not unmingled with a desire to punish.

The measure now before this body embodies the same principle upon which those measures were founded. The same arguments are made in support of the pending measure, to wit, that the southern people are to be distrusted and are incapable of local self-government.

We know now what those measures in those days did. They retarded and frustrated the coming together of the people of the different states. They gave us the solid South. They separated us politically, which separation continues until this day. They implanted a sense of bitterness in the minds of those people, not because of what had happened upon the field but because of what happened in Congress.

It is not in the interest of national unity to stir old embers, to arouse old fears, to lacerate old wounds, to again, after all these years, brand the southern people as incapable or unwill-

ing to deal with the question of human life. This bill is not in the interests of that good feeling between the two races so essential to the welfare of the colored people.

Nations are not held together merely by constitutions and laws. They are held together by mutual respect, by mutual confidence, by toleration for conditions in different parts of the country, by confidence that the people in the different parts of the country will solve their problems; and that is just as essential today as it was in 1865 and 1870.

In the beginning, Mr. President, I reject the pending measure as fundamentally not in the interest of the white people of the South, not in the interest of the black people of the South, not in the interest of national unity nor of national solidarity, not in the interest of eliminating crime. History has proven that it will be a failure, and those who suffer most will be the weaker race.

Mr. President, the race problem is the most difficult of all problems, and, in addition to the conditions which I have outlined briefly, the southern people had placed upon them the race problem under circumstances and conditions never before experienced by any people, so far as I know, in recorded history. In addition to and on top of all other problems the South had to grapple with the race problem. How well has it dealt with it?

At the close of the Civil War there were a little over 5,000,000 white people in the South; there were 3,500,000 Negroes. In Mississippi there were 100,000 more colored people than white people. In South Carolina there were something like 150,000 more colored people than white people. There were the two races, living upon the same soil, now equally free under the Constitution, one of them untrained and unschooled in the affairs of state, and untrained in citizenship. The problem had to be met. Was it easy of solution? Can one conceive of a more difficult problem placed before a people? I wish we could place ourselves in their position. It would help us to be sympathetic, sane, and just.

I call attention to some facts which lead up to the question of lynching. History shows that in the North in 1889, 1 Negro in every 185 was in jail; in the South, 1 in every 446. In the North the percentage of Negro prisoners was six times as great as that of the native whites, in the South four times as great.

Monroe S. Work, of Tuskegee College, has said:

There is a much higher rate of crime among the Negroes in the North than in the South.

That speaks volumes for the southern Negro and no less for the whites.

Professor Johnson, of Fisk University, has said:

The rate for Negroes is much higher in the Northern States than in the Southern States as to crime. Judging by the figures alone, for a 10,000 Negro population, the commitments were 88 in the South, 283 in the North

In a volume entitled "Negro Housing" published in 1932, I find the following:

The extent of property ownership by Negroes has in the past been greater in the South than in the North.

It will be disclosed that in some of the southern cities the percentage of Negro ownership of homes runs as high as 45 percent of the Negro population; in other places as high as 30 to 39 percent of the Negroes own their own homes.

In a bulletin issued by the Department of Agriculture in 1930 we find the statement that the value of land and buildings of farm property owned by Negroes increased from 1910 to 1930 as follows, giving the round figures:

	<i>Percent</i>
Virginia	58
North Carolina	140
Georgia	11
Florida	29
Louisiana	142
Texas	97
Mississippi	68
Alabama	41
Oklahoma	54
West Virginia	37

I mention these figures to show the progress of the Negro thruout the South in an economic way, for, after all, only in proportion as he acquires property and economic power can he hope to be secure in his political rights. That is just as true of the white man as of the colored man. And in proportion that he advances in education, in the acquisition of property, and in the acquisition of economic rights, in that proportion he will come to be regarded as an essential factor of the southern civilization, and treated as such; and to accomplish that has been the aim of the southern Negro, encouraged and assisted by the white people of the South.

I shall now read from a little volume to which I called attention a few days ago during the debate on the farm bill, a volume written by Gerald W. Johnson, who I have been informed is one of the editors of the Baltimore Evening Sun. He has written a remarkable volume upon the questions which pertain to the southern portion of the country. On page 8 of the volume he says, referring always to the South:

The problem of public education, for example, has not been solved. It is further from solution in the South than in any other region. But when one considers that the South has to teach more Negro children than there are children of all kinds in New England; and when one notes that it is spending far more of its total income on schools than is spent by any other region, its effort, even though but half successful, must command respect and admiration.

They must educate more Negro children in carrying this load than all the children of New England, and they are doing so; and by educating them they are fitting them for citizenship, schooling them against crime, and they are laying the only sure foundation there is for the extinguishment of crime among the Negroes. They are laying at tremendous cost the foundation for the good citizenship of the Negro, and while lynching can never be justified, nevertheless there is no more successful approach to the ending of lynching than thru education, thru bringing both races to understand their responsibility to society. I know of no finer sense of duty than that displayed by the South in the help it gives the

Negro in bettering his condition as to property, as to economical strength, and as to education.

I read again from this able writer:

It has been the fashion in some quarters to assume that the Southeast has remained almost completely inert in the presence of its social problems. This is far from the truth. A mere glance at the educational statistics of the region is enough to dissipate the impression that the Southeast has been indifferent or lethargic in this respect. The State of Florida, for example, spends 5.76 percent of its total income for school purposes, and North Carolina 4.38 percent; this is the largest percentage that is spent for similar purposes by any States save the Dakotas. . . . The Southeast spends 3 percent of its total income for higher education, the highest percentage in the Nation. It enrolled more high-school students in 1930 than the whole country did in 1900, and there are more accredited high schools in this region than there were in the United States at the end of the century. Its present army of 60,000 high-school graduates annually represents an increase of 500 percent within the last two decades.

I pause to say that if we knew as much about the South and what they have done and are doing as we pretend to know, we would not be so free to criticize. It is a horrible thing to see the body of a Negro burned to a crisp, swinging from the limb of a tree; it is a horrible thing to have a daughter or son, perhaps a mere child, snatched from your homes, carried into hiding, perhaps murdered. These are our problems, pressing for consideration, and they are undertaking as determined an effort to clear the slurs from the honor of the South as are we to rescue our honor in the North. "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye."

During the last session of Congress we had under consideration in the Committee on Education and Labor what is known as the educational bill, and, of course, it vitally affected the Negro people of the South, and they appeared in great numbers before the committee. At that time Senator Black, now Justice Black, was chairman of the committee. The most difficult problem was to work out absolute protection for the colored children in the enjoyment of the fund proposed to be set up. I must say that I never knew a per-

son more meticulous, more determined, more vigilant to protect the colored students in the enjoyment of that fund than was Justice Black. I was impressed with the fact that there was a determination upon his part to reach the Negro at that point in his life where he could best serve him not only with reference to general citizenship but as to the reduction of crime. Mr. Johnson states further in this volume:

The most conspicuous characteristic of the southern population, however, is its biracial character. A group of 8,000,000 people of a different color from the other 17,000,000 is a feature so startling that it may be expected to attract more attention than perhaps it deserves.

* * *

The inevitable result has been enormous waste of the Negro's potential value to the social structure. Not all of this is the fault of the white South by any means. The hasty and ill-advised effort made in the sixties to project the newly emancipated slaves into a political and social position they were not prepared to occupy has made any realistic treatment of their position extremely difficult. Not only did it create appalling prejudices but it erected very substantial legal barriers against any direct and forthright approach, and forced Southern political and social policy into a sinuousness that has been productive of a thousand evils.

This is, however, water over the dam. What confronts the Southeast today is the problem of making the best possible use of 8,000,000 blacks.

* * *

Only comparatively recently has any considerable effort been made to treat the disease, rather than to alleviate its symptoms—or, rather, only recently has the idea begun to spread that perhaps there isn't any organic disease, but only a series of functional disturbances. Since the turn of the century the Southeast has been making real, if not always adequate, efforts in the field of Negro education. With the rise of the Negro in the cultural and economic scale there has come also an appreciable reduction of the rigor of civil and social disabilities. And with both there is a strengthening belief that perhaps the traditional approach to this situation has been faulty.

Everywhere we find a determination to find the right way. The Negro is there. He is there to stay. The South knows that he is there to stay, that he is a part of the wealth of the South. We in the North may be interested in the Negro politically. We care little about him economically. But he is an indispensable factor in the economic development of the South. They can and will do for him far better without our interference or advice than with it.

Mr. President, the Negro has had a hard road to travel ever since he was given his freedom. A hundred-and-odd years of slavery afforded poor training for citizenship in the most advanced of nations. Almost overnight he went from slavery to take up the obligations of a free man in a free country; but, everything considered, he has done well; his advancement has been marked. Restricted, not by the Constitution of his country or the decisions of its highest courts, but restricted, almost cabined and confined, by the iron laws of society, nevertheless he has made progress. And where has that progress been greatest? In the South. In spite of prejudice, and statements to the contrary, facts and figures show it has been greatest in the South. In the acquisition of property and economic advancement generally the Negro has fared better in the South than elsewhere.

It is true, as is contended here, that at times he has suffered from mob violence in the South, but it is equally true that he has suffered from race riots in the North. But in all things which make for the advancement of the race as a race, the North has no advantage over the South in the story of the advancement of the Negro. We have shown no greater patience, no greater tolerance, no greater ability to deal with this race than have our brothers of the South. And now, because there is the power, because there are the votes, because it is possible to do so, it is proposed to call these great states and these people before the bar of public opinion and, after 70 years of arduous effort on their part, condemn them as unfit and unwilling to deal with this great problem, condemn them for having failed in the essential principle of home government, of home rule. After these 70 years, and after 150 years, taking the government's history as a whole, we now come to the time when we are asked to say that home rule or local government has broken down in a number of the states of the Union. We call these states and these proud people to judgment before the whole world and spread upon the records of the Congress our condemna-

tion, our judgment that in the most vital things of free government they have failed.

Broken down! Why? Because eight Negroes were lynched last year. There were 20 kidnaping cases in the United States last year. After all the efforts of the states and all the efforts of the Federal government, taking charge of those who crossed states lines, we still had 20 kidnaping cases as against the 8 lynching cases in the South. Is that an indication that the South is not in good faith and with honorable effort trying to protect the colored race and to give it the same protection that it gives the white race?

Lynching is the one crime, Mr. President, that is distinctly and markedly on the decrease in the United States.

I shall take time to read briefly some facts and give some figures.

Prof. Charles S. Johnson, of Fisk University, says:

Taking the period of 1889 to 1893 as 100 percent, it is of interest to note that every 5-year period has shown a decrease in the total number of individuals lynched.

He then gives the figures showing that from 1924 to 1928 there was a decrease of Negro lynching amounting to 84.8 percent. He concludes by saying:

It will be discovered from the accompanying graphs and tables that at the present rate of decrease lynching will apparently cease to be a problem in race relations due to its disappearance.

Further, he says:

In the 30-year period from 1889 to 1918, inclusive, there were 2,522 Negroes lynched.

That is about 84 a year.

He then calls attention to the fact that in 1924 the number had dropped to sixteen. Last year the number was eight. In many of the southern states lynching has practically disappeared. Virginia had only one case in ten years. West Virginia had none during the past five years. South Carolina had none during the past three years. Oklahoma had one in ten years. North Carolina had two in seven years. Arkansas

had three in nine years. Maryland had two in ten years, and none for the past three years.

I call your attention to a statement from the great Tuskegee Institute located in the State of Alabama. It reads:

There are a number of interesting features to be noted. From 1882 to 1885 there were more whites lynched than Negroes. Concerning the decline of lynchings in the United States, I call attention to sheet No. 2, "Lynchings, white and Negroes, by periods, 1882-1936." You will note that there has been a steady decline in the number of lynchings for each of the 10-year periods, 1887-96 to 1927-36. Judging from the trends shown in this table, there is every reason to believe that there will be a further decline in lynchings.

There are probably three major factors that have contributed to this decline. The first of these is the tendency for frontier characteristics in the South to disappear (lynching was a special characteristic of the frontier in America, both in the West and in the South). Second, the breaking down of isolation in the South by increased facilities: (1) Rural free delivery; (2) more telegraph offices, (3) more telephones in small towns and rural areas, and (4) recently the radio and paved roads. Third, increasing agitation within the South during the past 40 years against lynchings. This has resulted in an increasing sentiment against the evil. This sentiment has expressed itself in the increasing efforts to prevent lynchings.

From 1914 to 1919 the number of persons lynched was much greater than the number of persons prevented from being lynched. From 1920 to the present the number each year prevented being lynched has greatly exceeded the number lynched.

These facts and trends seem to indicate unquestionably that there will continue to be a decline in lynchings in the United States. Not only in these statistics but in many other ways is there employed a growth in the humanitarian attitude of the American people. This growth, I believe, has paralleled the development of educational and social agencies all of which bid fair to rid this Nation of the barbaric practice of lynching.

In other words, the problem is being met, the problem is being solved, and it is being solved in the way that America solves her problems when they are local and of a local nature; and that is thru the activity and the cooperation and the determination of the people themselves.

Mr. President, suppose Congress passes this bill; suppose it becomes a law; where must we go for its enforcement? The bill may be passed by votes from other states, but for its enforcement we must go to the juries in those communi-

ties which we condemn. The bill may be passed in the theoretical atmosphere of Washington, but it must be enforced down among the people in the realistic atmosphere of the Southern States. There will be the southern district attorney, the southern judges, the southern juries, and they must be depended upon for the enforcement of the law. Do senators think they will more likely enforce the law when they have been condemned in the sight of all the world, and in the face of such condemnation, than when they are appealed to from the standpoint of the sense of duty of their state and their sense of duty of citizenry?

We get back, after all, to the people themselves for the enforcement of the law. We have had an experience in this country showing that we cannot enforce a law when public opinion is not behind the law. The only way in which we can hope to have the law enforced is by the method that is now pursued by the southern people—that is, to educate the people up to an understanding that it is to their interest and to their honor to maintain law and order in their communities—and that they are doing.

Some years ago a great southerner discussed this question, and I cannot refrain from calling attention to some of his language. It seems to me fair, just, and so in accordance with the sentiments of the true patriot that it is worth while for us to stop and hear the voices of those who are wrestling with the problem at home.

Mr. Henry W. Grady said:

Nothing, sir, but this problem and the suspicions it breeds, hinders a clear understanding and a perfect union. Nothing else stands between us and such love as bound Georgia and Massachusetts at Valley Forge and Yorktown. . . .

I thank God as heartily as you do that human slavery is gone forever from American soil. But the freeman remains. With him a problem without precedent or parallel. Note its appalling conditions. Two utterly dissimilar races on the same soil—with equal political and civil rights—almost equal in numbers, but terribly unequal in intelligence and responsibility. . . . Under these conditions, adverse at every point, we are required to carry these two races in peace and honor to the end.

Never has such a task been given to mortal stewardship.

Is that not true? Can we find anywhere in history a task such as was assigned to the southern people at the close of the Civil war, with slaves for 100 years released, free as they should have been, but given the power to participate in politics without any training and without any experience? It was beyond their capacity, as it would have been beyond the capacity of any race immediately to assume in full, and properly discharge, the duties of citizenship. But those were the conditions which confronted the South, and with which they have been dealing.

The resolute, clear-headed, broad-minded men of the South . . . wear this problem in their hearts and brains, by day and by night. They realize, as you cannot, what this problem means—what they owe to this kindly and dependent race—the measure of their debt to the world in whose despite they defended and maintained slavery.

If you insist that they are ruffians, blindly striving with bludgeon and shotgun to plunder and oppress a race, then I shall sacrifice my self-respect and tax your patience in vain. But admit that they are men of common sense and common honesty, wisely modifying an environment they cannot wholly disregard—guiding and controlling as best they can the vicious and irresponsible of either race . . . admit this, and we may reach an understanding without delay.

Let us admit that the South is dealing with this question as best it can, admit that the men and women of the South are just as patriotic as we are, just as devoted to the principles of the Constitution as we are, just as willing to sacrifice for the success of their communities as we are. Let us give them credit as American citizens, and cooperate with them, sympathize with them, and help them in the solution of their problem, instead of condemning them. We are one people, one nation, and they are entitled to be treated upon that basis.

Mr. President, I now turn briefly to another feature of this measure. I shall discuss it later in more detail, referring to court opinions. But I call attention to this feature now which must be of concern to every member of this body, to everyone who believes in our dual system of government. This bill as it is drawn—observe my language—this bill as it is drawn strikes at the very heart, at the very life of local

self-government. I ask senators to reread the bill in the light of that assertion. It would place a construction upon the fourteenth amendment never contemplated by the men who wrote it—in fact, specifically rejected by them—and which, in my opinion, a fair construction in no sense sustains.

The bill openly and professedly declares in effect—and that is the theory upon which it rests—that the people in these states are either unwilling or unfit to maintain the most ordinary principles of organized society, and that in the face of the facts which I have shown, that they are really solving the problem.

Permit me to say here before I go further that I make no contention but that the fourteenth amendment has forever placed it beyond the power of any state to deny any person the equal protection of the laws, or to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process. I recognize also that the state acts and speaks thru its officers, legislative, judicial, and executive. I am not going to take refuge in technicalities, but I contend for what I believe to be a fundamental principle, and that is that while you may call a state thus acting and thus speaking to account, you cannot take jurisdiction over or deal with acts and deeds not done by the authority and by the direction of the state. It must at all times be state action. You cannot deal with acts under the fourteenth amendment not done by and under the authority and direction of the state. The dereliction of an officer in violation of the laws of the state, in disregard of the sworn duty exacted of him by the state, and subject to punishment by the laws of the state, cannot by any possible construction, either in law or in conscience, be the act of the state. To establish any such principle would be to undermine and break down the integrity of every state in the Union. If a state may not be entrusted exclusively with the authority and relied upon to exercise the authority to punish those who violate its own laws, public or private persons, then there is no such thing as local government, because the state is deprived of the very instrumentality by which it maintains state integrity.

Since this proposition first came before Congress the senators from the southern states have borne the brunt of the debate. They have been made to feel the criticism of those who look upon opposition as mere local prejudice. We are all prone to consider the race question as peculiarly a southern problem, and we leave our southern friends to deal with it without very much sympathy or interest. But assuming that we are going to continue this narrow and selfish course, when we come to read this bill it is found that it goes an arrow's flight beyond any race question. The way it is drawn and its legal terms lift the bill out of the region of the race question into the region of governmental principles.

I do not contend, of course, that the authors of the bill or its supporters are taking advantage of the horror which we all feel toward the crime of lynching to strike a blow at our dual system of government, but that is precisely what is happening; that is precisely what will happen in view of the manner in which the bill is drawn. The constitutional feature of this bill under its terms is just as vital to Idaho as to Alabama; it is of just as much concern to Massachusetts as to Georgia. If the Federal Government can send a United States marshal into the State of Tennessee to arrest a sheriff because he has failed to protect a colored man from violence, it can, under the same principle, send a United States marshal into the State of New York to arrest a sheriff, or other officer on whom the duty is imposed, because he neglected to protect the life of a citizen against the violence of thugs. It is just as much the duty of the state to protect the citizen from violence not under arrest or not assailed by three but by two or one. The Constitution does not classify crimes. It does not say that lynching is subject to the terms of the Constitution and that death by the act of thugs is not.

What does this bill provide? There is not a word in it which indicates that the failure to protect in any instance was due to the fact that the prisoner was a Negro. There is no provision indicating that the states of the South or their officers maintain one rule of conduct for the Negro and another

for the whites. There is nothing to the effect that the laws of the states favor the whites and do not favor the Negro. There is no indication or intimation in the bill that the failure of the officers to act was due to the fact that his prisoner was a Negro. This bill is not based in its terms upon discrimination against the Negro, because of unequal treatment of the Negro, but upon the theory the states have broken down in maintaining order and protecting life. That is not a local question but a national question. If the states no longer protect life and property not because of discrimination but because of failure to execute laws regardless of race then we have a great national problem to be met by constitutional amendment. The fourteenth amendment does not cover any such question.

In all the cases which are cited in the briefs sustaining this measure there will be found a specific provision in the statutes concerning the failure of the officer to act being due to the fact that the party in interest was a Negro. There is no such provision in this bill. This is a general proposition, dealing as much with one race as with the other. Let me read from the bill:

Sec 3 Whenever a lynching of any person or persons shall occur, any officer or employee of a state or any governmental subdivision thereof who shall have been charged with the duty or shall have possessed the authority as such officer or employee—

That would include the governor and all his subordinates in the executive department—

to protect such person or persons from lynching and shall have willfully neglected, refused, or failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such person or persons from lynching and any officer or employee of a state or governmental subdivision thereof who shall have had custody of the person or persons lynched and shall have willfully neglected, refused, or failed to make all diligent efforts to protect such person or persons from lynching, and any officer or employee of a state or governmental subdivision thereof who, having the duty as such officer or employee, shall willfully neglect, refuse, or fail to make all diligent efforts to apprehend, keep in custody, or prosecute the members or any member of the lynching mob, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Where is the provision there that deals with the lack of equality between the races or discrimination as to the races? There are no provisions in the bill requiring a showing that the failure of communities to protect a person was due to the fact that he was a Negro. In all the cases cited, there will be found a statute specifically requiring a showing that the officer refused to act or failed to or did not act because of the fact that race was involved and that a Negro was the person involved.

Let us carry this a little further. It is the first duty of a state, is it not, to enact laws to provide officers to protect life, liberty, and property? That is the first duty of every state. Suppose that a man is killed by thugs, we will say, in one of the great cities, without mentioning any particular one—and while the South lost eight Negroes by lynching last year the North lost hundreds because of acts of violence committed by thugs—and suppose that the state failed to take proper action under its laws and by its officers to protect the citizen on the highway or in his home against the acts of thugs; may we not, under the principle of law invoked in this bill, send an officer into that state to take charge of those police officers? What is the distinction in this bill between violence committed by a combination of thugs and violence committed by those who are combined into a mob? We are somewhat at a disadvantage in discussing the bill, because its authors have been entirely silent in presenting those features, and I am having to present it upon the briefs which I have read.

I think it might not be out of place here to call attention to another matter. The proponents of the bill are undoubtedly maintaining that the Federal Government will protect men in the South better than will the local communities. They are undoubtedly basing the entire measure upon the proposition that the Federal Government will execute the law. Well, we have the Federal Government in control of the city of Washington, which now, if not the first, is at least the second capital city of the world which is most plagued with crime.

Seventy-five people here have been robbed of their property in one night. How close the police were I do not know. I understand the police escaped being robbed.

We can all recall instance after instance published in the papers of young women disappearing and their bodies being found outraged and the criminals never being intercepted. Why is there any reason to believe that the Federal Government can enforce criminal laws better than can the state governments? The enforcement of law and the punishment of crime depends upon the will and purpose of the community where the crime is committed. Those advocating this bill are on a venture. They are going to take the responsibility away from the people in the South; they are going to say to them, "You are not qualified or willing to do the work; we are going to do it." Where is the record which shows that they will do it? What is the record?

We have now at the head of the crime department, if I may call it that, in the Department of Justice, perhaps the greatest specialist in the world in the running down of crime and criminals; we have a Federal kidnaping law by reason of the fact that kidnaping crimes generally pass state lines; but last year, 1937, there were 20 kidnaping cases in the United States, with the state and federal governments both working, and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover says that there never will come a time when there will not, in all probability, be kidnaping in the United States; that it is impossible to wipe out the crime; that so long as greed and the appetite for money are found in the human system, there will be kidnaping. Mr. Hoover very frankly states that it is impossible to wholly wipe out such crimes. They can be reduced to a minimum and lynching has been reduced to a minimum in the South.

Coming back to our Capital as an example of federal enforcement, I read from a local paper:

The criminals of Washington are taking \$30,000,000 a year from the citizens of this city.

They are being deprived of life, liberty, and property, certainly without due process of law as that term is applied

here. And the men in charge of the District seem to have thrown up their hands; they do not know how to deal with the situation. Yet the Federal Government is in control here; the Federal Government is back of them. They are not by any means doing as well as are the people of the southern states in meeting the crime problem.

Mr. President, we are dealing with the race problem. We need not blind our eyes to that fact. And the race problem is a problem which does not readily yield to legislative solution, to the rigid demands of the law. Take, for instance, the colored girl who, under great handicaps, has earned the right to be employed by her government upon an equality with everyone else. She goes with a certificate of competency from the Civil Service Commission to one of the departments here in Washington—here in Washington, under the aegis of the Federal Government—and when she enters the door and her color is discovered she is told that the place is filled, which is probably false. That happens not once but many times. She suffers injustice at the hands of her Federal Government. But that is a race question, and no law was ever made tight enough or strong enough to remove all its harshnesses and to eliminate all its injustices. Only the patient process of education, the uplifting power of religion, the tolerant, noble-minded men and women who give their thoughts to the cause can remove or mollify such injustices or such harshnesses. And that is being done; it is being done in the South; that result the South is achieving; the record so shows; and the people of the South are entitled to our commendation and not our condemnation. They are entitled to our cooperation and support.

This, Mr. President, is another compromise with a vital principle of our dual system of government. It is bartering the future for the supposed and transient demands of the present and at a time when the present is taking care of the problem. It is another instance in which our confidence in our scheme of government is not strong enough to say to

all races, all creeds, all groups, and all factions: Your problems, however serious, are subordinate to the principles of this government, and you must work them out within the compass of the long-tested and well accepted principles of democracy.

Every American must feel a slight sense of guilt, if not a sting of remorse, when he reads the Premier of Italy's reference to the bellowing herds of democracy, to free institutions as the decadent breeding grounds of insincerity and confusion. The fundamental principles and precepts of popular government are not in doubt. There is no confusion there. The confusion arises when we depart from those principles. It was the embodiment of the precepts and principles of popular government in the Constitution of the United States which put confusion to rout in this country, gave ordered liberty to the people, and strength and direction to government. For centuries prior to the declaration that the powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed, and the dedication of a new continent to that sublime conception, there had been nothing but confusion, nothing but turmoil and misery, nothing but brute force and enslaved masses. And all that will happen again if the advocates of arbitrary power, now inveighing against free institutions in the presence of their assembled slaves, have their way and the world again comes under their sway. Contrast the conditions of those periods with the period since the adoption of the Federal Constitution, with its establishment of law and order, the spread of contentment and happiness among the masses, with its unprecedented progress in the arts and the sciences, and you not only have your answer to those whose sole right to rule rests upon the law of force, but you have the most powerful appeal that can be made by mortal man to those who would compromise or weaken the safeguards of popular power.

I am perfectly aware, as we all are, of the tide which seems to be running against popular government everywhere,

of the base betrayal of the people in many countries where they once had at least some authority and hoped for more, of that profound egotism which regards as of no significance the bitter experience of men and women in their long quest for liberty. But against all these things, if we have the confidence in our form of government which we profess, we can place, not theory, not hopes, not ideals merely, but 150 years of achievement, of demonstrated popular rule, with its wealth of human happiness and human progress. How puny and hollow and fleeting in comparison are the achievements of usurped power, every hour of whose existence depends upon the continued suppression of human liberty.

And, Mr. President, in conclusion, the progress, the development, and the advancement of the South, including the last 70 arduous years, her history from Washington and Jefferson down, rich with the names of leaders, orators, and statesmen; her soil, her sunshine, her brave and hospitable people, her patient and successful wrestling with the most difficult of all problems, are all a part of the achievements of our common country and constitute no ignoble portion of the strength and glory of the American democracy. I will cast no vote in this chamber which reflects upon her fidelity to our institutions or upon her ability and purpose to maintain the principles upon which they rest.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS¹

A. H. VANDENBERG

This address was delivered by Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, on May 30, 1938. The speech came as the climax of a day of colorful activity in the national park. A procession, at least a mile long, marched to the national cemetery. In one automobile were four Union veterans, the only surviving Civil war soldiers of Adams County. The Senator spoke from a platform erected near the marble monument that marked the spot where Lincoln stood when he gave the first address on that battlefield. This oration by Vandenberg is to be examined as a demonstrative speech. The differences between it and the Vandenberg debates in the Senate are striking.

Mr. Chairman, fellow citizens, at this sacred moment, dedicated to the memories that have preserved America, we stand on hallowed ground. It is hallowed by the heroisms of one of the decisive battles of all times and history. It is hallowed by a victory which prophesied the end of civil war 75 years ago, and the beginning of an invincibly reunited nation. It is hallowed by the human sacrifice of brave men upon both sides who put their love of principles above their love of life. It is hallowed by the echoes of the Emancipator's great yet simple oration which packed the eloquence of the ages into 272 vivid words which live forever. In such a presence, humility takes possession of the soul, and except as we be dead to the finer sensibilities of life, loyalty to an indestructible United States takes possession of our hearts. It were better to acknowledge such a moment with a great silence on our bended knees. It is impossible measurably to meet it with a speech. Nothing can be added to what Lincoln said. His Gettysburg address is the challenge of Memorial Day—not only here where its benediction fell upon the

¹ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 83, no. 111. p. 10258-59. March 31, 1938. By permission of the author.

eternal tombs of particular battalions, but thruout the Nation wherever a single patriot-martyr's grave is greeted by his heirs to freedom.

It is for us, the living, . . . to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

These final phrases have a terribly impressive meaning in a modern world which is torn with destructive strife and marred by crushing tyrannies. Far from being a "world made safe for democracy," as we thought was our lofty objective in our last Great war, it is a world in which democracy under many a flag lies wounded unto death. It must not lie wounded here. More emphatically than ever, it has become our American responsibility that democracy "shall not perish from the earth." I do not mean that we are called to roam the world in armor, seeking to police the trends of destiny in other lands. On the contrary, and with all emphasis, I hold that we should mind our own business and keep out of other people's wars. But I do mean that it is our responsibility to keep our own pattern of democracy inviolate. Democracy will not have "perished from the earth" so long as we here maintain the institutions of popular government, not only as a boon to our own freemen but also as a beacon of hope to the oppressed in other lands. Democracy will have perished from the earth if we surrender.

Let no citizen think that we are immune to these seeping dangers that have others by the throat. As never before, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We do not have to battle for our free institutions in armed and bloody conflict—at least, not yet; and pray God such occasion never comes. But none the less we have to battle. There are new Gettysburgs each hour of every day. They are not military. They are civil. Thus they may be less readily identified. But thus they are the more insidious, and our hazard increases in proportion.

There would be no doubt about our unyielding response to another reveille if, for example, the ugly hands of communism were to reach openly for power. There would be no question about our brave and immediate resistance if the mailed fist of a man on horseback were to strike against our free institutions. But we must be no less alert, my countrymen, against subversive forces which less obviously, but no less ominously, undermine this Government of, by, and for the people. We have some avowed Communists. We have some avowed Fascists. But these are not calculated to be our deadliest foes. Our deadliest foe will be our own complaisance—our own individual, self-centered inclination to take the easiest way—if, as, and when the plea of some emergency invites us to the first relatively inoffensive steps which turn our feet away from the paths of which Lincoln spoke. The direction rather than the length of those steps is the fatal thing. One present breach in the dike of the Constitution, inconsequential though it may seem at the moment, can loose the final flood. And there is the warning that spells our only rule of safety. The Constitution of the United States is the indispensable charter of government of, by, and for the people. If it needs change, it can properly be changed only by the people themselves. Any other change is treason, treason to the American inheritance, treason to Gettysburg, treason to Memorial Day.

In his immortal Gettysburg Address, Lincoln recalled the spirit of the Declaration of Independence which, eight score and two years ago, brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. We are called to these tasks of promoting social justice and economic equalities among all our people. Those who have died for their America—462,562 of them in all our wars—put their hearts upon the altars of our freedom for these ideals.

The best, the most invincible, answer to those who would turn our Government to a different pattern is to make

America the place where life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are most easily achieved. That has been our relative record for 150 years. It is our task and our challenge to "carry on" in this same pattern. Let those who counsel a different way—and I refer not only to those open agitators who would uproot and overthrow the American system but also to those more subtle but no less subversive manipulators and regiments who would chain us to centralized bureaucracy at Washington—let them show us a land in which their theories have produced a greater freedom and a happier life. They cannot do it. Ours is the better way. Millions of American family hearthstones are our witnesses.

I do not mean that the American system is a static thing. I do not mean that we should forebear from useful change. But I do most emphatically mean that all change is not progress. I do mean that our basic principles of government of, by, and for the people—our constitutional checks and balances—are just as sound and just as precious today as at any other moment in the last century and a half. I do mean that this is a government of laws and not of men. I do mean that those who try to trade liberty for security are likely to lose both. I do mean that we stand today at another Gettysburg—another Armageddon—and that those who have died for their America—462,562 of them in all our wars—were fighting for a conception which, in sheer enlightened selfishness, we dare not desert. It is for us, the living, to be dedicated on Memorial Day to the task which they have thus far so nobly carried on.

Seventy-five years ago we proved at Gettysburg that the Union is supreme and indestructible. A union of what? A union of sovereign states. We did not prove—we did not attempt to prove—that the states themselves must wholly sink their independence and their individuality in the common mold. On the contrary, we vindicated the American constitutional system; and that system, from the hour of its birth, requires the least possible Federal activity to achieve essential Federal results. That doctrine is our strength and our salva-

tion. Home rule is inherent in our philosophy—and that philosophy runs on down to the maximums of self-expression and self-determination and self-reliance for each individual citizen, circumscribed only by the need for common action in behalf of the general welfare. This country is physically too big and too diverse to be managed, in all its intimacies of life and livelihood, from one central point. At our peril we ignore this axiom; yet there is a paralyzing tendency to ignore this axiom upon every hand. It is our menacing paraphrase of the world's trend toward dictatorship. We must resist it for the sake of our institutions and our liberties. We must resist it less government of, by, and for the people shall perish from the earth.

One other thing, among many, came out of Gettysburg in 1863 to which I would refer. It was more than the ante-room to victory for the Union armies and the Union cause. In its lengthened shadow came a reunited nation which bound up its wounds, healed its bitterness, and set itself indestructibly upon the rock of ages. Loyalty to the American conception knows no Mason and Dixon line. The Unknown Soldier who sleeps in glory on the heights of Arlington may be the son of one who fought with Meade at Gettysburg or one who fought with Lee. We are one nation, committed to one destiny.

We found the means to reunite ourselves in a wedlock that shall know no death. America could not exist without this fraternity of interest. But here again there are new Gettysburgs to be fought and won. We are torn today by class dissensions and class consciousness. Our people are divided into hostile groups, each striving relentlessly for its own objectives regardless of the common weal. In recent years we have been taught actually to hate one another—to call each other harsh and invidious names. It will not do, my countrymen. I care not whether the strife be between farmer and industrialist, between employer and employee, or between those who have and those who have not. In our America, we sink or swim together. United we stand, divided we fall. We cannot pull the lower one-third up by pulling

all three-thirds down. America is a partnership between 130,000,000 people. We must open all our minds to the spirit of cooperation. We must open all our hearts to an era of good will and mutual consideration. If it could be done in the final aftermath of Gettysburg in 1863, surely rational men and women—rejecting counsels of politics and prejudice and passion—can do it in 1938.

Mr. Chairman, these are but a few of the thoughts that crowd in upon me at this solemn hour. I conclude as I began. Memorial Day, particularly at Gettysburg, calls us to our better selves. This is an hour of consecration. It belongs to those who died that we might inherit the greatest blessings that may flow from human hands. It is for us, the living, to be dedicated anew to the America for which they gave the last full measure of devotion.

If this devotion once more calls us into uniform to defend the Republic in unavoidable war, may our patriotism vindicate their sacrifice. But war—any war—should be the last recourse of intelligent men and women in this modern age. The challenge to us is to preserve an honorable peace in peaceful ways—yet never to surrender at any price the ideals and institutions that have made us what we are.

There is a bivouac of heroes on the shores of the eternal life. They come from Valley Forge and the conflict that wrenched the Republic from the tyrannies of George III. They come from the War of 1812, and then from the Alamo and Monterrey. They come from Gettysburg and the travail of rebellion. They come from Chateau Thierry and the unrequited crusade for world democracy. To the memory of each we bring the rose of our deathless affection. To each we would pay our debt. But we cannot pay, we do not pay, except as, in our easier way, we pledge ourselves, with the earnestness of deep conviction, that the traditional spirit of the Republic shall survive and that—no matter what the lure to other paths—here in the United States, now and forever, government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

NO DEMOCRACY WITHOUT CIVIL LIBERTY¹

NORMAN THOMAS

This speech was given over WJZ of the National Broadcasting Company on May 8, 1938, at 6:00 P. M. Eastern day-light saving time. In April Thomas had been refused a permit to speak in the public square in Jersey City, which city had long been ruled by Mayor Frank Hague, a "red baiter." Thomas resolved to defy the prohibition in order to test what the Socialists regarded as abandonment of the right of free speech and peaceful assembly. On April 30, when Thomas arrived at the city square to address the crowd, policemen hustled him away and placed him on a New York-bound ferry. On May 18, 1938, the Department of Justice at Washington began an investigation to see whether the regime of Mayor Frank Hague "had conspired to violate basic constitutional rights in the case of Norman Thomas and other individuals."

Thomas has been regarded as a highly effective speaker, both on academic occasions and before turbulent open-air crowds.

Last night two Congressmen were kept from speaking in an American city by fear of violence on the part of a mob encouraged if not directly incited by the city government. The mob and the authorities professed to be saving the city from Communism. Their ignorance of real facts was shown by their denunciation of me for swearing allegiance to Russia and for having been the principal speaker at a Communist May Day meeting. As a matter of fact I spoke at a Socialist meeting, completely separate from the Communist celebration, and among other things protested Stalin's denials of civil liberty. They do Communism too much honor who make it synonymous with all desire for civil liberty in America. But if democracy is to be real and strong even if all of us who desired the old American rights of assemblage and free speech in Jersey City were Communists we should be entitled to

¹ By permission of the author.

them. Anything else is local fascism, the infection from which may poison the whole American body politic.

Jersey City has acquired a symbolic significance. Other American cities may be actually or potentially as bad as Jersey City. But various factors, including the political prominence of Mayor Hague, have combined to give Jersey City a national importance. It is a mirror in which other cities may see what they may become. It is a warning that neither the Declaration of Independence, the climate of America, nor the inherent qualities of Americans is a sure antidote against dictatorship. It can happen here because it happens habitually in Jersey City.

Of this my own recent experiences in Jersey City give evidence. They have been well reported in the press of America. I shall not dwell on them at length. And certainly I do not intend to try over the air or in the press the various legal proceedings which I have begun and shall begin under advice of my counsel, Mr. Arthur T. Vanderbilt of Newark, President of the American Bar Association. He is not of my political faith, but his legal services to civil liberty have been equalled by few men in America.

All America knows that the Socialist Party and I applied for a permit for such a peaceful May Day meeting as we have held hundreds of times in scores of American cities. The permit was denied as previous permits have been on the pretext of fear of disorder. I went to make a test case, found only a friendly crowd except for the police, was not arrested but was kidnapped and deported. The crowd was roughly handled. I invoked the aid of the Workers Defense League and its counsel, Morris Shapiro. Later I engaged Mr. Vanderbilt. First I invited President Roosevelt's attention to Mr. Hague's position as Vice-Chairman of the National Committee of the Democratic Party; wrote to the members of the National Committee to find if they were adequately represented in this vital matter by their chairman; drew the attention of J. Edgar Hoover to my kidnapping; and asked the LaFollette Committee on Civil Liberty to investigate Jersey

City. I have now made formal complaint under federal statutes against the Jersey City police and have reapplied for a permit for a meeting on May 17th. Other legal steps will be taken in due course on advice of counsel.

I am not fighting a personal battle; I have no private vendetta against Frank Hague or any of his henchmen. I am doing what I can to help in the struggle for an American democracy which is neither hypocritical, corrupt nor impotent. I am acting on one of the deepest of my convictions; namely, that America is in danger not from invasion by fascist armies from abroad but the growth of dictatorship from within. Jersey City with its pint pot Hitlerism is an almost perfect example of what we have to fear.

As one enters Jersey City from any direction signs proclaim that here is "Everything for Industry." The sign is literally true if one remembers that politics of a certain brand is also an industry. Jersey City is a town of powerful industries, potent politicians and poor people. One of the powerful industries is bookmaking which flourishes unmolested in Hague's Kingdom on the payment, it is said, by gamblers of an extra legal tax on tribute money.

Taxes are higher than in any comparable municipality in America and it requires only sight, sound and smell of Hague's city to know that the taxpayers get no conspicuous return in social income for their outlay. The outstanding exception is the elaborate and well equipped medical center which the taxpayers support and Hague exploits much as Hitler exploits similar services to the German people.

Mr. Hague has been Mayor of Jersey City since 1917, a longer period than any other mayor except the socialist, Daniel W. Hoan, in Milwaukee. A whole study of the strength and weakness of American democracy could be based on Milwaukee and Jersey City.

Of recent years Mr. Hague's power has spread from Jersey City and Hudson County to the state, from the Democratic Party to the Republican Party. He has successfully defied or defeated legislative investigation. The last Republican

Governor was, many say, his man almost as much as the present Democratic incumbent. Steadily Frank Hague has increased the number of elected and appointed officials in all departments, including, it is often asserted, the judiciary, who acknowledge allegiance to the man who boasted "I am the law." His private fortune has grown with his years of office holding out of all proportion to savings from his salary. But his power has grown faster than his wealth. Only the other day citizens of New Jersey told me that Frank Hague was immune to any action by the Federal government or the President as leader of his party, because of the support Hague had instructed his representatives in the Senate and Congress to give to the New Deal in Washington in return for his right to be the sole dealer in Jersey. I cannot yet believe that a local dictator has reduced the federal and state governments to subservience.

But the mounting legend of Hague's power is enormously sinister. If the stories told of him in the recent series in the New York Post are true it is idle to speculate about fascism or democracy in Jersey City. Democracy has already lost. Men and women vote in Hague's domain, but so do they in Mussolini's, Hitler's and Stalin's—and the immense majorities for the dictators are manufactured in much the same way. It doesn't matter much how often you count noses if the dictator by fear, favor, or false information can control the man behind the nose. There is no democracy without civil liberty, only a dangerous and pathetic mobocracy.

The new magazine, *Ken*, has a vivid story of the kinds of control Mr. Hague has established over his subjects under the forms of democracy. I cannot corroborate those stories in detail. But I can testify that on Saturday, April 30th and since that date men in New Jersey have drawn me aside to whisper furtively, after looking around as if for spies or secret police, "We're with you" or "This can't last forever."

But they are afraid to speak out, afraid even to fight police brutality or false arrest lest some relative in these hard times

lose his place on the payroll or their tax assessments be raised or some ordinance be enforced in discriminatory fashion against them. It is legend how Hague brought the Jersey Journal to heel when it was criticising him. Is not Jeff Burkett, Hague's critic, in jail for six months, allegedly for obscene and abusive language? Was not Hague's political foe, Longo, the only man brought to trial for irregularities in primary petitions after he had charged the Hague machine with wholesale frauds?

On these matters I am not an authority. But I know how the American rights of assemblage, free speech and free press have been denied to those whom Hague dislikes. His government gave only reluctant, belated and formal consent to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upholding the right to distribute non commercial literature in the streets. In fact men were beaten and deported Saturday April 30th for exercising that right. Hague, his subordinates or his government, are now involved in proceedings alleging tampering with the U. S. mails, assault, kidnapping, illegal denial of civil rights to the C.I.O., etc. I do not predict the outcome of these legal actions. That they have been brought is a sign of revolt against the long continued policy of breaking up meetings and deporting or kidnapping American citizens whose opinions are disliked by Hague's police. Unless this revolt is successful the differences between Rome or Berlin and Jersey City in respect to liberty are unimportant and not all to Jersey City's advantage.

Of course, like every dictator, Hague wraps himself in the flag! He is fighting Communism. So is Mussolini. So is Hitler. And they all fight it by emulating the worst features of Stalin's rule, by copying not the best but the worst in that which they denounce! Dr. Johnson said that patriotism was the last refuge of the scoundrel. It is the first refuge of the dictator. Hague and some other Americans need no lessons from Hitler in stirring up the prejudices, the fears, the greeds which mask themselves as national or local loyalty. Long ago he learned the Roman maxim: "divide and govern"

and applied it to divide the exploited workers and set the browbeaten citizens in rival camps.

I charge that mob opposition both to me and to last night's meeting was deliberately stirred up by the Hague machine. I have letters from responsible citizens alleging that Hague's police and office holders systematically worked to form the mob on the basis, incidentally, of false information.

The Catholic war veterans, Director Casey alleged, took the lead in opposing me. I have spoken in hundreds of American cities without opposition from war veterans, Catholic or otherwise. I once spoke on Black and Tan activities in Ireland to many of these same veterans in Jersey City to their resounding applause. Surely responsible Roman Catholics must see how dangerous and invidious is the position of Catholics whose church has suffered at the hands of dictators when they deny to others the rights they justly claim for themselves and denounce a Socialist internationalism less closely organized than the internationalism of the Roman Catholic Church. By its notable work on the side of labor, fighting against Hagueism, it has disproved Hague's claim of complete Catholic support.

Hague's victory like the victory of the Ku Klux Klan in Tampa Florida will mean death for democracy. In the name, then, of the freedom of America, of all our hopes for ourselves and our children in this most favored of lands, I raise these specific questions:

President Roosevelt: You are hero and leader to millions of Americans. You have repudiated for yourself, your party and your country the degradation of lands, where men are slaves to dictators. Have you no responsibility both as our chief executive and as leader of your own party for some of the things that have happened under Democratic Party rule, let us say in Tampa, Florida, where Shoemaker was killed, or in the barony of the Vice-Chairman of your National Committee? Is it only foreign dictators whom we are to fear and fight?

Members of Congress: Have you no responsibility for the vindication of liberty against peonage in the cotton country and the boast of a local politician that he is the law? Will you starve the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee before its work is done?

Members of the Democratic National Committee: How dare you prate of economic royalists and claim to be foes of special privilege while you keep Frank I-Am-the-Law Hague as your Vice-Chairman?

William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor: I am, as you know, a member of a union still part of the A.F. of L. I am not a Communist, and if I were I would still be entitled to democratic rights. These are important to all men but most of all, perhaps, to the workers. Yet leaders of the A.F. of L. in Jersey City, inspired partly by hate of the C.I.O., partly by fear of Hague's power and hope of his favor, have lent themselves to the tactics of the local Hitler. Can you afford for the sake of labor to keep silence while this democracy is betrayed?

People of America: Yours is the final court, yours the decision. Will you make democracy real, will you save the civil liberties without which all our talk of the American way is sounding brass and tinkling cymbal? You and you only can see to it that the slogan of our towns and hamlets is not "Everything for Industry"—but everything, including industry, in the service of a fellowship of free men.

WHAT DOES THE EUROPEAN SITUATION MEAN TO US?—A DEBATE¹

GERALD P. NYE and DOROTHY THOMPSON

This debate in which Gerald P. Nye of North Dakota and Dorothy Thompson were the disputants, took place on the evening of March 28, 1938, in the series of programs of America's Town Meeting of the Air. Since the first of these meetings on May 30, 1935, some ninety broadcasts have been given. The National Broadcasting Company donates the time and pays the expenses of the program. The broadcasts have taken place between nine-thirty and ten-thirty on Thursday nights on the NBC coast-to-coast Blue Network. The radio audience has been estimated at from "two to five millions." More than 100,000 comments by mail have been received.

Senator Nye, Chairman of the Senate Munitions Committee, engaged in heated Senate debates on foreign relations during the Third Session of the Seventy-Fifth Congress, notably the debates on April 19, 20, 21, 27, and 29, 1938.

Dorothy Thompson, a special writer for the New York *Herald Tribune*, the only woman included in the present book, has been a headline speaker on the lecture platform and over the radio. She addressed the "ladies night" dinner of the Union League Club, in New York City, in April 1937, the "first woman to address the club's membership since it was founded in 1863."

According to George V. Denney, Jr., the Moderator, "Good women speakers are difficult to find. Dorothy Thompson and Mrs. Eugene Meyer are among the best."

Mr. George V. Denney, Jr. Chairman:

Good evening, neighbors! I wonder if you can imagine some of the problems we face in arranging a program as important as this one. Picture the swift march of events of the past two weeks. While England negotiates with Ger-

¹ *Bulletin of American Town Meeting of the Air*. Vol. 3. No. 21. March 28, 1938. Columbia University Press, New York City. By permission of the authors and by special arrangement with *Town Hall, Inc.*

many and Italy about a four-power pact, Hitler startles the world by invading Austria and making that nation a part of the German Reich. Mussolini, skiing in the Italian Alps, remained silent until last week, when he reaffirmed his faith in the Rome-Berlin axis. General Franco began a new offensive in Spain. The Chautemps government in France fell, and against his will Socialist Leon Blum again became Premier of France. In Germany, General Goering shouted defiance to the world to dare dispute Germany's rights in Austria. The Chamberlain government in Great Britain suffered a staggering blow from British public opinion for its failure to foresee these events, and the shadow of Anthony Eden, resigned Foreign Secretary, was thrown across the door of 10 Downing Street in London.

What does the European situation mean to us? Indeed this seems to be the most important question before the American people at the moment. For, no matter what happens over there, our own affairs will be materially affected one way or another. As sovereign citizens of one of the world's greatest democracies, we must try to understand the complex forces in the world today which seem to be bent upon driving us down the road to war.

We have been doubly fortunate this evening in having secured two outstanding proponents of world peace, but each advocating different ways of achieving it. United States Senator Gerald P. Nye of North Dakota, Chairman of the Senate Munitions Committee, will be our first speaker. Miss Dorothy Thompson, one of the ablest journalists of our day, a former foreign correspondent for American newspapers in Germany, Austria, and other European countries, and, I am happy to say, also a member of the Board of Trustees of Town Hall, will be our second speaker. Following their addresses, we will have our usual question period. I take pleasure in presenting at this time our first speaker, the Honorable Gerald P. Nye, United States Senator from North Dakota.

Senator Nye:

On some things Miss Thompson and I are not in disagreement. We both reject Fascism and Communism. We each are anxious about saving democracy, tho I wonder if we would agree upon just what shade, brand, type, and style of democracy it is we want to save, and I am sure we can agree upon one answer to the question of debate tonight.

The question is: "What does the European situation mean to us?"

Our common answer to that question would be: It means trouble aplenty—a challenge.

If Miss Thompson could have her way about it, I assume the challenge would be met by what she calls a policy of "collective security" or "parallel action." It is my hope that she will enlighten us by indicating whether she means our moving into the League of Nations, entering into cooperative quarantines and sanctions, joining with others to determine who are the aggressors in war and then operating jointly against the one damned by the majority, or combining the English-speaking peoples of the world into a united front behind hitherto unheard of banks of armament. Perhaps she means just a "gentlemen's agreement" between two or three powers, including ourselves—an agreement that will keep Americans asking: "What is our foreign policy?"—a question never to be answered until action under the agreement is called for.

If I could have my way about this challenge which the European situation presents, I should most emphatically let experience take Uncle Sam by the hand and remind him of the pitfalls of other days, show him all of those things which are understood to invite and trip a war-hating people into the fires of war, and to help him destroy some of those very selfish influences which have been known to destroy his better judgment. This I advocate, tho I know it shall invite the bitter insinuation—so often heaped upon those who entertain like thought—of being of the "peace-at-any-price ranks," a

"dumbell," one of the "scruttle-and-run tribe," a "spineless pacifist," or a "fatuous isolationist." Time was when it was easiest to simply cry "Communist" when one entertaining these views raised his voice, but that can hardly be the resort now, since the Communists are very definitely "collective security" advocates.

I prefer this policy of trying to stay out of other people's wars as against the policy of "collective security" because of our past experience with collective effort—which incidentally finds us still collecting—and because of the warnings, issued since the beginning of our Nation's life, to "beware of entangling alliances."

"Cowards," "isolationists," "scuttle boys," "spineless pacifists," "dumbbells." Have you not noted how freely these terms have been tossed about of late weeks? Its meaning is quite apparent to many. It is the desperate cry of those who have shuddered because Americans have developed a slowness in being roused to the war pitch. Something must be done to discredit those who preach against haste in anger and of the failures of which experience reminds us! Americans, wanting to know what these wars are all about, since they seem to settle nothing and unsettle everything, don't respond readily when someone pleads for joint action by nations in placing quarantine signs around a bad-boy country. Instead of becoming excited about the proposal, the people from experience ask: "Doesn't that mean war? Who's going to enforce the quarantine and pay the bill?" When an American gunboat and Standard Oil tankers, huddled together in the waters of a nation engaged in war, are torpedoed by warring planes, the people, instead of letting the incident urge them into that war, sit back and skeptically remark: "What were the ships doing there anyway? I thought we were done with dollar diplomacy! I wonder if the shrapnel in the bombs dropped by the Japanese planes upon these American ships was some of the scrap iron we've been selling to Japan." Or "I'll bet the gas that gave power to the motors

of the attacking planes was some of that delivered to Japan in the same tankers that were bombed."

Ah, the finest preparation a nation ever had to prevent war is that armor which experience and knowledge gives us. We will do well to keep those two splendid aids by our side these days if we would meet the challenge which Europe presents.

Our place in the world, our progress, is definitely traceable to our rule against political and military entanglements abroad. Our distress of recent years is largely traceable to our lone abandonment of that rule. We ought to have learned our lesson.

"We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars," said President Roosevelt. Again he said: "We are not isolationists, except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from wars."

If we will but continue to hew to that line, strengthen our written neutrality policy, which is intended to prevent development of an appetite for more and more of profit available from other people's wars; if we will cease letting American corporations, assisted by our military establishment, arm all the world with instruments of warfare, stop financing other people's wars, definitely make prospect of profit from another war in which we engage impossible; if we will destroy in part the motive of profit which plays so large a part in these mad armament races in which the world engages; if we will learn to be content with a national defense that guarantees protection against attack; if we will give to the people a voice in determining when the country shall engage in foreign war; if we will do these things, we will not write off all danger of war but we will very definitely assure a little longer life for the finest democracy that is to be found upon this earth.

I say to you with conviction and sincerity that our engagement in another war on any material scale, even tho it be for the salvation of democracy elsewhere, will be to win fascism right here at home. Who will write the guaranty

that we can add to the load left us by the last war the burden of another war and be free from the causes that have given life to the dictators of today?

Some would have us cooperate with other nations if we would save their brand of democracy and ours, too. There is much of highly emotional wish fulfillment in talk about collective security. There are several truths which it is well for every one of us to remember in today's campaign to get the people ready for another war.

First. When will we look for the machinery of collective action today? The very British officials who might want to resort to it have called their own League of Nations "futile and hopeless."

Second. While there is no collective action left among the nations of the world, there are certain military alliances, notably the one between England and France in defense of the western border, the one between France and Czechoslovakia, and the one between France and Russia. Opposing these is the alliance between Italy and Germany. Perhaps the morning will find another between Britain and Italy. Will we tack on to one or more of these to insure our security?

Third. We are not being invited into a campaign to defend powers which can properly be called democratic powers. The defense of the British and French Empires, were we to aid in it, would involve the continued subjugation of hundreds of millions of black and brown peoples. The British and French have pledged themselves to fight whenever their Empires are attacked, and a military alliance will pull us into a defense of these Empires. Do we want it?

Fourth. Let us not overlook the fact that a collective policy with Britain as our associate is a policy to protect and defend all that Britain possesses today, and maintain the status quo which was left at Versailles in the form of a peace treaty that proves to have been the birth of another war. Britain took much of the spoils of the last war. Do we want to pledge ourselves to help her hang on to it? Do we want

to help hold for Britain, for instance, Hong Kong, which was her toll from the unholy opium war? Collective effort is the way to win a hand in it.

Fifth. How interested is Britain in a holy crusade for democracy, except as a slogan for American consumption, when we see Chamberlain bargaining with Italy and Germany? What about the Hoare-Laval 1935 agreement, which so injured the Ethiopian cause, the British interests and actions in Spain, the pressure on France against French intervention in Spain? Democracy?

Sixth. It is nonsense to speak of a program of quarantine against aggressors as a way to avoid wars. A quarantine is the first step to war. And incidentally, the phrase of the quarantine advocates is: "Use all economic measures short of war." Yet all of them from the New York Times to the Daily Worker vigorously fought the one step this side of war which would have really kept us short of war, namely, the war referendum.

Seventh. The one sure way to kill off democracy in the United States is to enter another war. There may be people in the land who care less for democracy here than they do for the welfare of the British and French Empires, and for Russia, but they ought to be reminded now that they are leading themselves and the rest of us to a slaughter.

Eighth. What President Wilson said, afterward, of the causes for the World War, was the epitaph for our first great adventure into collective security. Our influence was used by our Allies to help break the economic democracy in Austria and Germany, and with that the political democracy. The peace that was written was the peace which commercial rivals make with a bankrupt debtor.

Our last collective move was little more successful. In January 1937 the administration stage-managed and put over an embargo on Spain. It was a collective security action—done in cooperation with England and France and their famous nonintervention committee. As I pointed out at the

time, it was not neutrality; it was cooperative action. The idea was that both sides would be cut off from munitions by all powers. Now see what has happened. Instead of shutting off both sides as they proposed at the time the Embargo Act was passed by Congress, one side was allowed a preponderance of support. Reports have just come of a stevedores' strike in England. What were the men protesting against? Against loading a ship with munitions for nationalist Spain! Now, this is the way they do things over there, and I do not criticize, I do not condemn. They have a right to do things in whatever way they see fit. But I wish to point out that the results of such collective action have very little connection with Secretary Hull's "orderly processes" for which he wants us to contend nobly and disinterestedly the world over.

Finally, what ethical shame can attach to America by reason of the fact that we take advantage both of our geographical and historical position to keep out of the chaos in Europe, to try to maintain at least one pool of sanity in this world, to attempt to limit the area of conflict rather than extend it? The only place we can bring such a worthy influence to bear is in our own country.

But what if South America is subjected to military invasion at the hand of a European dictator? The only invasion to fear is invasion of ideas. The only way to meet that is not thru trying to dominate South America by our Navy but to do such a good job with democracy that we can make democracy more attractive than what the dictators have to offer, and to be so fair in our trade that South America will count our trade better than that of the dictators.

I am ready to admit that challenges may come taking us as a cooperator into other wars, but let us be sure of our ground another time, sure of our cause, sure of a reasonable chance to win the cause after winning the war. And let us remember, too, that we were once before collected into the cause of security for others with no better security prevalent now than was the case before we poured our wealth into the cause.

Collective action 20 years ago cost us a burden of loss and expense which Calvin Coolidge said would total more than \$100,000,000,000. Already the total cost upon us is estimated at \$65,000,000,000. That, incidentally, is more dollars than there have been seconds of time since the year 1. And yet there are people wondering where the depression came from, and wanting to repeat the experience.

Collective security? Not again; at least not until there is better reason to believe we can really win it. Until there can be much better reason than now exists, we will do well to recognize a policy of collective security as a policy of collective suicide.

Chairman Denny:

Thank you, Senator Nye. Our second speaker will be Miss Dorothy Thompson, special feature writer for the *New York Herald Tribune* and other papers, and, we are glad to say, special lecturer for the Town Hall.

Miss Thompson:

I wish with all my heart that I could agree with Senator Nye. I wish with all my heart that I could be convinced that this country, in a world torn by war, revolution, and the breakdown of every concept of international law and international economy, could retreat inside her own borders and, regardless of the rest of the world, maintain here and improve here in the United States freedom, democracy, and prosperity.

I do not differ from Senator Nye as to what is desirable. I differ from him as to what is possible. It seems to me that Senator Nye and his associates who have been busy in the last months devising ways in which America can maintain neutrality have been operating under certain fallacies. First of all, the legislation that has been devised thus far has been to keep us out of the last war, not out of the next one. But I don't even think that the kind of neutrality legislation that we have or that has been proposed would have kept us out

of the last war. On the contrary, I think it would have gotten us into it with much greater expedition.

We kept out of the last war for three years, the last world war, because it was possible by maintaining trade as neutrals under the theory at least of the freedom of the seas, to keep our economic system from collapsing. Without that trade we should have had a panic immediately, and the panic would have driven the people toward participation in the war as the threat of it eventually did when that panic became imminent three years later, because men will always fight before they will starve.

As the present Neutrality Act stands we are at least as badly off, and I think much worse off as far as entangling alliances are concerned, than we were in 1914. Declaring an embargo on arms to both sides in case of a conflict means that we discriminate in favor of those nations who already have plentiful arms and discriminate against the unarmed or the slightly armed.

If Germany, for instance, were to go to war with Czechoslovakia tomorrow—which I don't think she will do because she will apply economic sanctions to Czechoslovakia and make them work, which the democratic countries haven't had the guts to do so far—but if she were to go to war with Czechoslovakia tomorrow, the arms embargo would injure Czechoslovakia and aid Germany.

If the President puts the cash-and-carry clause into effect, we immediately discriminate in favor of all nations that can control the seas, notably in favor of the British and the French on the Atlantic, and of the Japanese on the Pacific. And if we refuse to invoke the cash-and-carry clause, as we failed to do in the Chinese conflict on the flimsy pretext that an undeclared war is not a war—have it any way you like!—then we become even more clearly un-neutral than if the law did not exist.

And if we should make a completely rigid and mandatory neutrality act to suspend all trade in munitions and raw

materials—and that is just about all the raw materials there are, raw materials needed for munitions—then we go on record that we acknowledge the theory that in time of war peaceful nations should get off the high seas altogether, and that amounts to a blanket invitation to aggressors. And besides this, it begs the whole question.

In the final analysis, countries are not governed by idealism; they are governed by self-interest, and—unless they are completely decadent—by a vivid sense of self-preservation. Profound students of the last war are by no means agreed as to the relative importance of its causes, and, as far as the United States is concerned, Charles Beard, the historian—who agrees with Senator Nye and not with me—says, after an exhaustive study of the documents, that he does not know why the United States went into the last war, but he dismisses any single cause such as war loans by private bankers, or the activities of munitions makers, or pro-British members of the diplomatic service. All these were factors, human beings being what they are, and they all played some part. But I am still inclined to agree with the memorandum of Robert Lansing written at the very beginning of the last war, that in case the British Empire and France were about to be conquered it would prove to be to the irresistible self-interest of the United States to intervene on their side. He said nothing about saving the world for democracy. It was only apparent to him that the complete disruption of the *status quo* all over the world by violence would result in economic collapse and panic in the United States.

Now we have been told, and especially the whole generation of our youth has been told, that wars are only the result of the clash of private capitalism for markets. This doesn't clarify anything. It confuses it. Some wars have been so mad. The last war was certainly to an immeasurable extent such a war. But the fact is that the present menace to the peace of the world comes from military collectivisms in which all private capital is rigidly subjected to the exigencies

of the state. The present menace does not come from individual capitalists. It comes from politicians, acting in behalf of totalitarian and nationalized economics.

It has been demonstrated in our lifetime, my friends, that no form of social or economic organization is a guarantee against nations taking the warpath, and if one can learn anything from history—and that is the only thing we can learn anything from, because all the rest is guesswork—one can learn this: that all periods of prolonged peace so far in the world have been maintained because the overwhelming force was on the side of maintaining them. The Roman Empire held the peace of the world for generations. The British Empire held it for more generations. After the last war, most nations attempted to make a system of collective security to hold it, and that has now broken down. It broke down, I think, first because the United States, the greatest single power in the world, refused to join and influence what it did; and second, because those that were in it welshed when it came to fulfilling their obligations.

But the point is that with that breakdown, war has begun again—in Ethiopia, in Spain, in China, and in Central Europe. There have always been "have not" nations in the world, and the only thing that has kept those "have not" nations from fighting has been the conviction that if they did, they would not win.

The same rules apply in international affairs that apply in domestic affairs. You keep individuals from looting their neighbors' property in three ways: by establishing prosperity and social justice, so that men do not have to fight for food; by establishing law, so that their conflicts may be peaceably settled, and by enforcing the law by police. All social order rests eventually on force. As civilization advances—and civilization means, among other things, the careful cultivation of inhibitions—force is less and less used. But it remains in the background and is the eventual arbiter, and is an instrument of civilization so long as it remains on the side of law.

The transfer of force against law is anarchy, and that is what we now have in the world, and this country can no more continue its existence as a free democratic nation in a world of anarchy than the State of Vermont could continue its democratic existence in a nation given over to anarchy.

We are part of a world order, whether we want to be or not. We are tied up with the world by commerce. We have investments and factories in nearly every country on earth. Maybe we operate them for profits, but the profits also go to workers. We have communications with every country. Our exports are only 10 percent of our total trade, but that 10 percent is the margin between prosperity and panic. Not only that, we are tied to the world by innumerable imponderables of culture. We are part of the world of ideas. Every revolution in the world since this nation was founded, and including the American revolution, has had repercussions upon this country and vice versa, even in the days when we were enormously farther separated from the rest of the world than we are today. Tonight, in this city, German-American Nazis are holding meetings in Yorkville to celebrate Mr. Hitler's conquest two weeks ago of Austria, and Communists are holding protest meetings here and elsewhere. We are living right in the middle of a world revolution, one of whose instruments is international war, and we talk about isolation!

Let's get clear just what isolation means. It means getting off the face of the earth; if it is going to be carried to its final consequences—and if it isn't then it doesn't mean anything—it means taking our ships off the ocean and our cargoes off other people's ships. It means abandoning our investments wherever they may be. It means detaching our currency from the world exchanges. It means suppressing all news which may exacerbate our people. Maybe you think this isn't important. It is so important that Mr. Hitler has asked Great Britain officially to curb her press—and Great Britain has had a free press for two centuries—on the ground that the publication of facts prejudicial to the Nazis will inflame public opinion and lead eventually to diplomatic difficulties and

eventually perhaps to war. It is perfectly logical if you are going in for isolation, and the British government is already warning its press and thus carrying out the general order. It means, eventually, suppression of free speech. And all of these together mean economic and social revolution, and a panic that can only be averted by a dictatorship and complete government regulation and control of foreign trade and everything else.

We have heard the argument tonight that if we get brought into a war we shall have dictatorship in this country. That is true, but there is something beyond that fact, namely this: that if the present condition of anarchy continues in the world, we shall also have dictatorship in this country. We are going to get it, coming or going, unless this thing stops. It is not enough to keep out of war. We have got to use our power in combination with others who want peace and justice to prevent this war from going on.

We have tried isolation for 150 years; it has been our continual policy—no entangling alliances—and in all that time we have never been drawn into a minor European conflict. But we have been drawn into both major conflicts in the 150 years, into both world wars, the Napoleonic War in 1812 and the World war. There is nothing in our present condition that makes us less a part of the world than we were 100 or 125 years ago. I ask you to use a little logic. We do not want to fight for the British Empire. But it does matter to us whether the British Commonwealth of Nations dissolves either by war or by gradual encroachment, whether the French and Dutch empires crumble, whether Germany and Italy become masters of Europe, whether Japan becomes the undisputed dictator of Asia, impinging upon New Zealand and Australia. Do we honestly think that if this happens the still unexploited resources of South America will not be involved? What would be the position of democratic United States standing alone in such a world, a world ruled by new forms of despotism, heading mobilized peoples governed by military collectivism? What then would be our position on the seas?

How large a navy would we have to have to protect even our own shores? If this condition comes about, we will then have isolation. I wonder how we will like it.

The world has actually been given a blueprint of what is to occur, and step by step that blueprint is being followed, and still the world, like Mr. Micawber, thinks that something is going to turn up and God is going to pass a miracle to save us. Mussolini announced that he intends to erect a new Roman Empire and has proven that he means it. Hitler has announced that he intends to govern all Europe east of the Rhine. We know what these governments mean. But these things can't be done without more militarism and more blackmail and more Austrias and more Spains.

So, either another general conflagration or a continuation of the present undeclared wars will go on and will mean eventually the ruin of this democracy. They will set in motion social forces and economic cataclysms that cannot be halted at any borders. Nation after nation will be bankrupted, and that bankruptcy will lead to the establishment of new economic systems which will prey upon the rest of the world with every kind of unfair competition backed up by the blackmail of the threat of further war. We will live in a world governed by super-rackets. No democratic economic system will be able to stand that pressure. In order to compete with the Fascist states we shall have to turn ourselves into Fascist economies; that is what it will amount to. Then we can all welter together in poverty and misery and militarism.

Fascism and any other sort of military collectivism can survive in a world of anarchy as long as it suffers no overwhelming military defeat and is not strangled by collective economic sanctions. Fascism and communism actually will approach each other in the long run. These completely mobilized societies can survive because they are states composed of soldier slaves as ancient Sparta was. But what cannot survive except in an orderly world is liberal democracy. Actually, 80 percent of the manpower, wealth, and natural resources of the world are in the hands of America, the French, British, and

Dutch empires, and the Scandinavian states—all liberal democracies, not what we want, but a great deal nearer it than our friends, the Fascists, are. And these democracies, if they had the will and determination to do so, could enforce order thruout the world, and at the same time they could offer prosperity to the whole world by establishing greater justice and by presenting opportunities for peaceful trade expansion along lines which have been proposed by Secretary Hull and expanded by Premier van Zeeland of Belgium.

But 80 percent of the world is being terrorized by 20 percent, simply because the 20 percent are organized and audacious and the 80 percent are disorganized and paralyzed by fear. We don't have the choice between security and risk; we only have a choice between two risks. The one is perfectly clear—it not only is clear, it is right on the doorstep—world anarchy, world revolution, and world conflict, creeping from sea to sea and border to border. The world is always run on somebody's terms. I prefer, even on behalf of the peoples living under dictatorships, that it should be run on the terms of the democracies, on the terms of the 80 percent. (Applause)

Chairman Denny:

Thank you, Miss Thompson. Before we begin the audience participation, Senator Nye is entitled to a couple of extra minutes because Miss Thompson ran over her time. Senator, you may have that time now if you like.

Senator Nye:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. I might utilize this time to remark, among other things, concerning Miss Thompson's suggestion that isolation, to keep out of other people's wars, means wiping ourselves out of this world. Very, very definitely, I believe that isolation to keep out of other people's wars is about the only assurance that we have today of ability to stay on this world as a civilization.

Miss Thompson has also made reference to what seems to be a great desire for peace in Europe. I am inclined to

wonder just how deep that desire really is. We do have, of course, very definitely an interest in Europe; the failure of Europe to hold together may get us into war. However, that intense interest does not extend, to put it very bluntly, to giving a blank check to Europe's confused and secretive diplomacy. It does not extend to underwriting all the Hoare-Laval deals of the present and of the future. One of our chief current interests in Europe is the amazing phenomenon of England and France deciding that something is more precious to them than saving their own power, their own form of government, and the independence of Austria, Spain and Czechoslovakia. They refuse to make a hard and fast military alliance with Russia, the other great peaceful power over there. Such an alliance, which would guarantee the peace, seems more horrible to them, evidently, than the loss of their own power and the loss of peace itself.

We are interested in this because, instead of taking in their natural ally, they reach all the way across the ocean for our men and our arms. It seems to me that before America lends herself to participation in another foreign cause, the identity of which isn't clear, America will do well, I repeat, to ask to see all the cards face up on the table before she consents to being collected into another collective security program. (Applause)

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY¹

ROBERT LAFOLLETTE

Senator Robert LaFollette gave this speech at an Anti-war rally at the Hippodrome, New York City, on March 26, 1938. Oswald Garrison Villard, the liberal publicist, presided. Other speakers included Norman Thomas. LaFollette's address was broadcast by the Mutual Broadcasting System. The speech contains LaFollette's philosophy of peace and his program to "keep America out of war." LaFollette used these same arguments repeatedly in the lively Senate debates in April, over the Administration's billion dollar naval expansion authorization bill. Senator Walsh, Chairman of the Naval Committee, was spokesman for the vast armament budget. On May 3rd the Senate approved the bill, 56 to 28.

There is now, fortunately, an interval in which our foreign policy may be discussed freely.

Today, while one-fourth of the peoples of the world are at war, we face much the same prospect as the President described last fall in his Chicago speech:

The political situation in the world, which of late has been growing progressively worse, is such as to cause grave concern and anxiety to all the peoples and nations who wish to live in peace and amity with their neighbors

In the past few weeks we have witnessed disastrous battles in China and Spain, significant changes in the political composition of Austria, religious controversies, and the deposition of generals and ambassadors in Germany, new sensational Moscow trials, the resignation of Great Britain's Foreign Minister, and we have heard the ominous rumbling of shifts in the European balance of power.

Reports of such disturbances abroad, however, are not new. For more than two years scarcely a month has passed by without some incident or crisis involving war or threat of war:

¹ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 83. No. 49. p. 4073-75. March 8, 1938. By permission of the author.

in 1935 Italy's invasion of Ethiopia, the imposition of League sanctions; in 1936 the outbreak of civil war in Spain, the intervention of Italy, Germany, and Russia with men and materials of war; in 1937 acts of piracy in the Mediterranean, the bombing of Almeira by German battleships, and finally, without a declaration of war, the invasion of China by Japan.

Meanwhile world armaments have reached the highest point in history; four times as much is being spent today on implements of destruction as the nations of the world were spending at the outbreak of the last war. Strangely enough, the amount spent on armaments is highest in the one great nation which is farthest removed from and most secure against the hazards of war, the United States.

Along with proposals for a billion-dollar naval-expansion program and a war-mobilization bill, there has been an ominous rise in the tempo of debate and efforts to arouse sentiment to support these measures. The President delivered his message asking for a record-breaking armament program on Friday, January 28. On that day the State Department released its story of a series of indignities suffered by Americans in the Orient, altho the official protests on these episodes had been made some days earlier. Perhaps the exact timing of this release was merely a coincidence, but it had the effect of whipping up sentiment for naval expansion. There had been unconfirmed rumors of negotiations for Japanese concessions in Mexico. It is rumored that Japan is building bigger battleships than England or the United States. A surprising amount of publicity has been given to the arrest of people accused of being spies. Our naval experts have made a sudden discovery of the Atlantic Ocean. The German-Italian-Japanese anticommunism pact is used as an argument in favor of a bigger Navy for the United States. Even the salmon off the coast of Alaska have been brought into the limelight. In congressional hearings, in the lobbies of Congress, in the newspapers, in the newsreels, and over the radio there seems to be a drive on to make the American people apprehensive about the danger of war.

But we should distinguish sharply between trouble abroad and the danger of attack at home. No one questions the reality of strife and crisis in various parts of the world. But it is a mistake to assume that America is therefore in danger of attack. Our country cannot be successfully invaded by any conceivable foreign enemy or possible combination of enemies. If time permitted, I could quote to you testimony from our ablest Army and Navy experts in recent years, from our statesmen, from profound students of foreign affairs, from the most competent authorities on the question of national defense. The overwhelming weight of this testimony is that the United States is not in danger of any possible overseas invasion. Expert testimony from naval authorities comes from such men as the late Admiral Sims, Admiral Phelps, Standley, Bristol, Yarnell, and even Admiral Leahy, if his recent testimony before the House Naval Affairs Committee is read carefully. Army experts include such men as Generals Rivers, MacArthur, Butler, Hagood, and the two majors who wrote a book on American defense, Dupuy and Eliot. Scholars like Dr. Beard and Dr. Healy likewise conclude that the United States is secure. There is no country or group of countries with enough money and forces to conduct an overseas invasion of our shores.

You will not find a single responsible authority who is willing to state that the United States can be successfully invaded by any particular nation or possible combination of nations.

No country would dare leave its territory, its women and children exposed to the armaments that are heaped up a few hours distant. No country would be so foolhardy as to risk its fate in an expedition across thousands of miles of ocean against a nation which is today the greatest all-around power in the entire world.

The proper line of defense of this country has been described as extending from Alaska to Hawaii to the Panama Canal to the Virgin Islands and to the coast of Maine. If defense operations are kept within that broad arc, the experts

and authorities are agreed that this country is adequately protected against any feasible contingency.

The danger of war for the United States cannot come from an outside attack upon our shores. The danger of war for us rests in mistakes in our foreign policy.

At this critical juncture it is imperative that we formulate realistic policies, policies in keeping with our sound American traditions, that meet the actual situations in the world about us; policies that have the deliberate approval of the American people. It is a burlesque of representative government if policies are secretly formulated by the executive without the approval of Congress and without the knowledge of the people whose destiny hangs in the balance. I stand upon the proposition that the Congress and the people have a right to participate in national decisions which may lead to war.

Prior to our declaration of war in 1917 decisions were made by the President and his advisors which made our entry into the World War practically inevitable. While these decisions were being made Congress was not consulted. Then Congress was suddenly asked to vote for a declaration of war. The people, who had voted for Wilson because "he kept us out of war," were suddenly asked to sacrifice their lives for a cause which we now know we did not even understand. Lest there be a repetition of this secrecy, lest perchance more mistakes be made, Congress and the people should demand their right to participate in the formation of these vital decisions.

Everyone hates war and wants peace. There is no disagreement on our aim. There is no question of the sincerity and good motives of the President, the Secretary of State, and every other American who loves his country. But there is great disagreement, reasonable disagreement, about the means which will achieve our common purpose. Communists like Earl Browder and conservative Republicans like Nicholas Murray Butler urge a policy of "collective security." This line of action is denounced as "collective insecurity" by equally

variegated opponents, who perhaps don't agree on any other subject. Newspapers like the *New York Times* speak kind words for "parallel action" with Great Britain. But an English magazine founded by the late G. K. Chesterton carried an article written by Hilaire Belloc which strikes a different note. It is entitled "Can We Rope in America?" He states with brutal frankness: "It is commonly said up and down Europe that we can make the United States do what we like. . . . We got the United States into the Great War on our side. . . . Can we rope them in to fight or threaten to fight the Japanese? . . . That is the important question of the moment. . . . As things now stand, our chances are . . . about 50-50."

Neither the Congress nor the people have been told how this country is to maintain in this troubled world such fine ideals as "the moral consciousness of the world," "the principles of humanity," and "the foundations of civilization." But once more we are being urged to cooperate for peace by influential leaders, and it seems wise to review the results of our past efforts to this end.

From 1921 to 1936 the United States offered the nations its leadership in efforts to limit armaments. Our three attempts to cooperate with the rest of the world in regard to Japan in 1932, Italy in 1935, and Spain in 1937, all had very different results than we expected. These attempts show we have been as willing as other nations to cooperate in the peace of the world. But they also indicate that in the minds of other great nations of the world there are many other considerations than a desire to preserve peace, international law, and the present boundaries. They want peace, but not at the price of a loss of trade. They want peace but not at the price of having a revolutionary government as a near neighbor. It is a doubtful question whether powerful elements in Great Britain and in France do not prefer fascism in Italy or Spain to its alternatives.

Our great venture into international cooperation in 1917 ended with the economic interests of the great nations

determined to wipe out German competition. This course blasted the foundations for peace in the world. Before the people of the United States listen to another invitation to co-operate they should demand an answer to the question of whether or not the nations of the world are willing to do anything for peace that may seem, even temporarily, to hurt their vested interests. This question stands behind the present alignment of nations in the world like a gallows.

Some there are who assert that to gain peace America must join hands with the other "peace-loving democracies" of the world in a crusade against treaty-breaking, war-mongering dictatorships. Those who subscribe to this thesis form a strangely assorted company of prominent liberals, conservatives, and radicals.

No thoughtful person looking at the world today would be so foolish as to dismiss the threat of fascism and dictatorship as groundless. But our past experience should make us realize that we cannot preserve democracy either abroad or at home by trying to police the world. Nor can we salvage peace and democracy by organizing a holy crusade, nor by forging an iron ring around Germany, Italy, and Japan to freeze the status quo, nor by simply outbluffing the dictators. Do not forget that any action along these lines will leave the deep-seated economic factors which cause war and fear unsolved. They were not ended by the World war. Nor will they be ended by lining up the so-called democracies for a show of force. But refusal to accept these methods as effective should not be interpreted as condoning the action of treaty-breaking powers thruout the world.

Those who argue for our assuming responsibility for policing the world make two major assumptions which I cannot accept.

First, they assume that the United States can participate in economic sanctions without running any serious risk of having to engage in war. Second, they assume that if such economic sanctions failed, and a war resulted, that war could and would accomplish its announced objectives.

Both of these assumptions are rash and unconsidered. They are gambles on hopes which have never been realized. They are refuted by 2,000 years of history. Sanctions sound mild, but their effective use always involves the almost certain danger of war.

The fact that sanctions are a form of war and can only be employed by nations ready to go to war was acknowledged on December 21, 1937, by Mr. Anthony Eden in the House of Commons:

. . . There are two possible forms of sanctions—ineffective, which are not worth putting on, and effective, which means a risk if not a certainty of war.

I am unalterably opposed to the United States embarking on a policy of sanctions, but if it ever does so those who make such a policy possible will have to assume responsibility for the horrible consequences of the next step—war.

The assumption that modern war can accomplish democratic and idealistic objectives our experience in the last war proves untrue. War is a means of executing national policy after all other means have failed. It is an attempt to operate on a complicated organism with a meat axe.

War cannot bring enduring peace. War cannot promote democracy. The United States entered the World war with the announced objectives that it was a "war to end war," and "to make the world safe for democracy." Our cooperation in this idealistic crusade ended in a sordid peace and a disordered world.

One-fourth of the world is involved in war today and the mounting burdens of armaments prove that peace does not result from war. Dictatorships in all but two of the large nations of Europe testify that war does not promote democracy.

Those who hope to save democracy by another war have forgotten or they ignore these tragic lessons of the World war. Another general war will not preserve democracy. It will raise even higher the barriers of nationalism, and it will make impossible the solution of the complex problems

confronting the world. I take issue with those who contend we must join in punitive collective action to preserve democracy at home. This argument is as fallacious as it is plausible. Our participation in another war will cost us upward of \$100,000,000,000. It would result in a much lower standard of living than could be created by any gradual decrease in our foreign trade. Nor is that all. The one thing predictable about our involvement in another major war is that it will be followed by a great post-war depression in this country. The lowering of the standard of living would then come all at once. It is at that moment, in a world full of revolutionary change, that the real menace to our own form of democracy would arise.

We do not have to choose between punitive collective action as a means of keeping our foreign trade and the policy of complete isolation without foreign trade. I maintain that by friendly relations with all countries we can enjoy foreign trade. Then if war abroad curtails that trade, we can resort to a program of Government employment to meet the emergency caused by a temporary loss of export business just as we have met the violent swings in the volume of our domestic business.

I do not accept without great qualifications the idea that there are certain "have" and certain "have not" nations in the world. We have some poverty in our nation which can almost match the worst in Europe. Germany and Italy and Japan would have a higher standard of living today if they were not spending so much on armaments and on military adventures.

The "have" versus "have not" picture is oversimplified, as is the picture that there is nothing to do but engage in collective action to punish all treaty breakers and preserve present boundaries.

We must face the fact that in some nations from a fifth to a fourth of their national income is being poured into armament production. While it has caused their economy to expand, it has likewise distorted their industry, and it has

its limits. After the most fantastic demands of the armament experts have been satisfied and every citizen has a gas mask, then the nations in question will either have to use their armament in a war or suffer a great depression, with the possibility of revolution. The only way of escaping those deadly alternatives is some program which will make it possible for them to switch from arms production to an expansion of peacetime goods. Herein lies the principal hope for peace in the world.

To the extent that other nations demonstrate their genuine adherence to this purpose we should cooperate in reciprocal economic reconstruction. But our greatest contribution to the preservation of democracy and peace can be made thru solving in our own country the economic and industrial problems so largely responsible for unrest in the world. The United States, unhampered by the ancient "blood rusts" and heritages of racial antagonism, can serve as a leader in working out the complexities of modern industrialism.

Our best service to the world and our country will be for us to follow the wise advice President Roosevelt gave President Hoover at the close of the 1932 campaign when he told him to "turn his eyes from 'backward and crippled countries.'" We should look to our own country and put idle manpower to work on a great broad program of public works. Thus, we will find new outlets for capital investment in conservation and construction, not in instruments for destruction.

The devastating floods in California this past week are only another of Nature's warnings that we cannot longer delay a vast program for conservation and restoration of our resource base without ultimate disaster to our Nation.

Beyond the needs of adequate defense against attack, public and private capital should not be diverted to armaments while there is a shortage of 2,000,000 houses in this country.

When capital, either public or private, flows into constructive channels, it not only gives work but it stimulates

capital and consumer goods, increases purchasing power, and lifts the total national wealth and income. But when capital flows into production of armaments, the whole economy is ultimately disrupted.

President Roosevelt, on his good-will tour to South America, clearly summarized the effect of huge armaments on the national and world situation.

He said:

It is false employment, it builds no permanent structure, creates no consumers' goods for the maintenance of a lasting prosperity. We know that nations guilty of these follies inevitably face the day when their weapons of destruction must be used against their neighbors or when an unsound economy, like a house of cards, will fall apart.

A program offering an immediate hope for prosperity and an increased standard of living in other nations is the surest way to stop building houses of cards.

A sound foreign policy requires that we should cooperate with other nations if they are genuinely prepared to make an honest effort to solve world problems thru reciprocal economic reconstruction. I do not suggest that we should move in the direction of assisting the nations now caught in the vicious circle of armaments and war unless they are willing to abandon the race to arm and to scrap enough of their existing equipment to insure a lasting peace.

But whether we can secure cooperation upon this constructive basis or not it seems clear to me that the people of the United States should:

First. Resist the present effort to build up our Navy beyond the needs of adequate defense.

Second. Adopt the amendment to the Constitution recently introduced by twelve senators, which will give the American people the right to vote on the question of our becoming involved in a war outside this hemisphere.

Third. Oppose our participation in punitive collective action, whether it be in the form of economic sanctions or war.

Fourth. End the fiction that war does not exist in the Far East, and invoke the Neutrality Act, which will put an end to the allowed irresponsibility of our citizens remaining in war zones, traveling on belligerent ships, loaning money to belligerents, and shipping their munitions thru danger zones.

Fifth. Oppose the war mobilization bill, which would confer broad dictatorial powers on the executive in time of war.

Sixth. Advocate a genuine wartime taxation measure which will take the profits out of war.

Seventh. Adhere to the principle that our wealth and productive capacity shall not be diverted to the building of armaments for the purpose of expanding our domestic economy.

Eighth. Preserve democracy at home by the inauguration of a broad program to restore and conserve our resource base, provide adequate rural and urban housing, give educational opportunity for youth, assure more generous standards for social security, and a more equitable distribution of our annual income.

In a troubled world these policies provide a working basis on which to restore prosperity and maintain peace.

THE PROTECTION OF DEMOCRACY¹

HERBERT HOOVER

This speech was delivered by the former President of the United States before the Council of Foreign Relations at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in New York City, on March 31, 1938. Hoover had just returned from a six-weeks trip to Europe. He visited fifteen countries, including Belgium, France, Switzerland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Poland and Sweden. He had conferred with Hitler, Dr. Schacht, Göring, Lebrun, Miklas and King George. According to the *New York Times*, "Mr. Hoover, as he appeared before the Council of Foreign Relations, became the man Hoover, without title, whom the world loved and adored after the World war as its greatest benefactor and especially as the friend of the children of all peoples."

Over the years since the war I have received frequent invitations from many governments, cities and universities in Europe who urged me to be their guest. This year I felt free to accept. It has been a unique honor to a private citizen of a foreign country. I come home deeply sensible both of their hospitality and their touching memory of American aid in times of war distress.

I welcomed the opportunity to observe at first hand the political, social and economic forces now in motion nineteen years after my last stay in Europe.

It seems unnecessary to state to an American audience that we are not isolated from the fateful forces that sweep thru Europe. In 1917 we were directly enmeshed in Europe's great war. And you will not forget the fact that in 1931, after we had started to recover from our home-made slump, we were plunged into the deepest world-wide depression until then known to our history by the financial panic which swarmed out of Central Europe. While we cannot wholly protect

¹ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 83. No. 78. p. 7166-69. April 14, 1938. By permission of the author.

ourselves against these intellectual, economic or political forces, it is imperative that we understand them. Thru understanding we can avoid some mistakes. We must abate some of their violence.

First of all, let me say I am not here tonight to tell governments or nations abroad what they should do. It is not the right of any American to advise foreign peoples as to their policies. But it is our duty to consider for ourselves the forces outside our borders which inevitably affect us.

In order that I may give to you my conclusions as to the American relation to these shifting European forces, I must first attempt to present to you a picture of them over the period of years which led to today's conditions.

As you are aware, I have had other direct experience in the European scene at different critical periods during the last thirty years.

The first of these periods was in professional work before the Great war. That period was the golden age of Europe. Then Europe was progressive and virile. Thru the impulses of modern invention, the standard of living and comfort was increasing. Thru progressive thought, economic and social abuses were decreasing. Intellectual and spiritual freedom were on the march.

The second period of my contact with Europe was the first two and a half years of the war from 1914-1917, when, in the name of America, I dealt with the heart-breaking backwash of war victims while the guns still boomed on the front. I moved freely on both sides of the battle line. I saw the rise of human brutality and its sinister employment of all the equipment of modern science. I witnessed the complete eclipse of everything that made for a better humanity.

Then came the armistice, and I had a third period of direct experience in Europe thru government service. Again I had a unique opportunity to see another era of great human forces in motion. That time it was my duty to administer, on behalf of our country, a great effort at cooperation with the former enemy governments—to restart the

wheels of life in Europe. We joined hands with some twenty nations to restore communication, transportation and credit, to aid agriculture and industry.

We sought to revive hope, to replace hate with sympathy. We fought a victorious fight against the most horrible famine and the worst sweep of pestilence since the Thirty Years war, when a third of the people of Europe died. And we did much to nurse into promising youth the infant democracies which had sprung into being.

That intervention by America to heal the wounds of war was second only to our military intervention to end the war. Whatever the failures may have been since, we can take nothing but satisfaction in our effort to reconstruct both enemy and friend alike.

During the armistice period the world was filled with a sense of joyous relief, of hope and confidence. The spirit of democracy and personal liberty had sprung into being over all Europe except in Russia. Freedom and government by the people seemed to us the guarantee of both progress and peace. Men thought a new and glowing period had dawned for humanity. They believed the forces of brutality had exhausted themselves. They thought that civilization, tho grievously hurt, had learned an unforgettable lesson. I confess that I myself am on record as less optimistic because of the attitudes toward Germany.

Now for the fourth period of my contact with Europe—nineteen years after the peace. While this journey has been one of glowing hospitality, it has not been a visit to review the splendors of cathedrals or castles, of art or scenery. I had no need to go to Europe to read statistics. We have plenty at home.

I had no need to go to Europe to learn the history of those nineteen years. But I welcomed the opportunity of this visit to discuss the forces in motion with more than a hundred leaders whose friendship I had enjoyed in the past and probably another hundred whom I met for the first time.

In all I had these opportunities in fourteen countries. It is impossible for mortal man wholly to evaluate such forces, even on the ground. It is possible, however, to learn more of the furniture in men's minds. And certainly with such contacts it is possible to form impressions of elusive yet potent movements which cannot be gained from this distance. And these forces are cumulating to affect our country greatly. They are cumulating to affect the very foundations of contemporary civilization itself.

Seven obvious forces or factors have come to the forefront in Europe over these nineteen years.

The first of these is the rise of dictatorships—totalitarian, authoritarian or centralized governments, all with so-called planned economies. Nationalism, militarism and imperialism have certainly not diminished in nineteen years. At one moment (if we include the Kerensky regime in Russia) over 500,000,000 people in Europe embraced the forms of democracy.

Today, if we apply the very simple tests of free speech, free press, free worship and constitutional protections to individuals and minorities, then liberty has been eclipsed amongst about 370,000,000 of these people. But today there are 30,000,000 less people living under liberal institutions than there were before the war.

The second great movement today, partly cause and partly effect, is the race to arms. Every nation in Europe—Communist, Fascist, democratic—is now building for war or defense more feverishly than ever before in its history. In five years their expenditures have doubled from four to eight billion dollars annually. That is probably three times as much of their national substance as before the war. Europe today is a rumbling war machine, without the men yet in the trenches.

The third process in motion is increased government debts and deficits. There is hardly a balanced budget in Europe—that is, if we strip off the disguises of words.

Government debts are increasing everywhere. Another inflation in some form seems inevitable.

The fourth movement is every European nation is striving for more and more self-sufficiency in industry and food production for either military reasons or to meet the necessity of "Planned Economy." This applies not only to the Fascist and Communist areas but in some degree to even England and France.

The old-fashioned barrier to imports by simple tariffs has proved inadequate to protect these policies. New and far more effective walls have been erected around each nation by quotas, exchange controls, internal price-fixing, clearing agreements and intergovernment agreements on both purchases and sales.

The fifth factor is the failure of the League of Nations as a potent force for peace, and its complete replacement by the old shifting balances of power. And they are certainly shifting.

The sixth of these forces is fear—fear by nations of one another, fear by governments of their citizens, fear by citizens of their governments and the vague fear of people everywhere that general war is upon them again. And there is the fear of the promised massacre of civil populations from the air.

The seventh force is the steady increase in some nations of brutality, of terrorism, and disregard for both life and justice. Concentration camps, persecution of Jews, political trials, bombing of civil populations are but the physical expression of an underlying failure of morals terrible to contemplate.

All in all, it is an alarming and disheartening picture. There is a brighter side. Their recovery from the depression has been better than ours. They have little unemployment. Some part of employment, especially in the authoritarian States, is due to a boom in armaments, non-productive public works and subsidized self-sufficiency programs.

And I do not believe general war is in immediate prospect. War preparations are not complete. The spirit is yet one of defense, not of offense. The power of military defense has so greatly increased over the power of offense that armies hesitate to move. New balances of power emerge to neutralize each other. Some groups still recollect the frightfulness of the Great war. Other groups are constantly working for peace and appeasement of the strains of Europe.

Many of their statesmen have skill and great devotion in guiding the frail craft of peace around the rocks in the rapids. But the world cannot go on forever building up for war and increasing fear and hate. Yet so long as there is peace there is hope. And my admiration goes out to those many leading men and women in Europe who are working so courageously and even heroically to preserve the peace.

These are the visible, apparent tides and moving storms. There are still deeper currents beneath them. I hardly need catalogue them. They comprise all the inheritances of the war and in fact of history.

There were the injustices and unrealities of the peace treaties. There were the debts and post-war inflations that led up to the European financial collapse in 1931 with its enormous unemployment and misery, both to themselves and to us.

There has been one blunder after another. Not the least of them have been the lack of cooperation by the Allies with the struggling democracy of Germany; the rejection of the American proposals of disarmament in 1932 and the destruction of the currency conference of 1933.

There is the ever present fact of a thousand years of European history, that on a score of boundaries there exist zones of mixed populations, each with its own age-old hates and aspirations. Whatever way these boundaries may be drawn, some people will be separated from their "fatherlands." Their agitations are perhaps the key to much European history and the key to one repeated war after another.

Perhaps this was what George Washington had in mind in his Farewell Address.

There sounds constantly through this labyrinth the shrill note of new philosophies of government and the echoes of old orders of society disguised in new phases. There are democracy, socialism and communism of fifty-seven varieties; there is fascism with its variations from soft to hard; there are autocratic forms all the way from disguised democracy through authoritarianism, totalitarianism to dictatorships and unlimited monarchy.

And these movements contain as many dangers for the American people as either the military forces or trade barriers of Europe. They require examination in any inquiry as to American policies.

I need not recall to you that after the war the first rise of hope to this distraught humanity was democracy. And the steps by which this liberty was lost are as important to the American people as what actually happens under despotism when it arrives. They indeed need to sink into the American mind.

No country started with the intention to sacrifice liberty. Each started to solve economic problems. In broad terms the steps are always the same. The economic system of Europe before and after the war was relatively free. There were many deep abuses. The new democracies brought resolute reforms on a large scale. But with the handicap of the miserable inheritances of the war Utopia did not come.

Then came socialism hand in hand with its bloody brother communism crying immediate Utopia in a wilderness of suffering people. They took advantage of the tolerance and freedoms of liberal institutions to mislead the people. Their methods were the preaching of class hate, the exaggeration of every abuse, the besmirching of every leader, blame for every ill that swept over their borders.

At the next step politicians arose by trying to compromise with these enemies of true liberalism. The result was governments constantly interfering with the proper functions of

businessmen, labor and farmers. By these compromises they further weakened the initiative and enterprise of the men who really made the system work. They destroyed that confidence and energy by which free economic systems are moved to great production. Finally came vast unemployment, conflict and desperate people.

But socialism has not triumphed from its work. Socialism and its compromisers in Europe have invariably served only to demoralize democracies and open the door to reactionary forces.

Italy produced fascism. Fascism promised a new Utopia through restored order, discipline and planned economy, jobs and future for the youth. It is worthy of emphasis that fascism has already begun in the form of planned economy. And it was ushered in by the same cries and slogans that they were for the liberation of the common man.

With economic planning once started, each step has required another until it arrives at government dictation to business, to labor and farmers of wages, hours, production, consumption, prices, profits, finance, imports and exports. Coercion becomes a necessary instrument, and then it is but a few steps to complete dictatorship. All opposition becomes treason.

Denounce it as we may as despotism and the destroyer of liberty and abhorrent to free men, yet the fascist form of government is today a raging power. Its acts are being rationalized into a philosophy. It has now embraced a sort of mysticism based on theories of racialism and nationalism. It is becoming a militant ideology. It does not hold within its original boundaries. Fourteen nations in Europe, with 240,000,000 people, have adopted these notions of fascism in major part.

In Germany fascism has had its most complete development under the iron rule of the Nazi party. In order better to understand the Nazi regime we must not overlook its apparent accomplishments. It has brought about a gigantic

mobilization of a materialistic system at the hands of the government.

Great industrial wastes in strikes and materials have been eliminated. Great efforts have been obtained from the people in work and sacrifice of comfort. Progress has been made toward self-sufficiency. Some sort of employment and economic security has been brought to all who comply. And concentration camps give security to the balance.

New houses, jobs and more recreation have been brought to the underprivileged. The support of a gigantic growing military machine has been successfully squeezed out of an already skimpy standard of living. Germany has been restored to a first-class military power. It is today feared thruout the world. Germany today burns with a prideful sense of restored self-esteem. Youth has been fired with new hopes and high emotions.

So far as material things are concerned the average German is today better off than five years ago. Yet to a lover of human liberty there is another side to even this picture. All the remaining democracies in Europe have made sounder and greater recovery from the depression than has Germany or any of the fascist States in the same period. And the standard of living is higher in all the democratic States than in any of the fascist States.

But for us there are deeper issues in all this. Under this regime the spirit of man is subordinated to the State. The individual must be developed into conformity with the national will as expressed by the leaders. Whatever is deemed by them as good for the State becomes the standard of justice, right and morality. That has become the basis of law.

And fascism has demonstrated a way to fool all the people all the time—by suppression of all criticism and free expression; and by drilling children and youth, stage by stage, to a governmentally prescribed mental attitude. A controlled press and organized propaganda have poured this new faith into the adults. It has stamped out, or controlled, every form of independent association from trades unions to uni-

versities. It has instituted a form of terrorism, for the fear of concentration camps is ever present.

Its darkest picture is expressed in the heart-breaking persecution of helpless Jews. Intellectual sterility and deadened initiative and individuality are its inevitable results. It is becoming a gigantic spartanism. And let no one believe it is about to collapse.

Parallel with the rise of the fascist philosophy, Marxian socialism is a dying faith. They have some things in common. They are both enemies of liberty. The gigantic experiment in socialism in Russia is now devouring its own children and shedding rivers of blood. And it is moving steadily toward a sort of fascist regime.

Now we must distill some conclusions as to what should be the American attitude toward all this maze of forces. We may divide our relations to them into three parts. Our relations to these forces politically; our relations to them economically; and our relations to them socially.

I found most nations in Europe convinced that we would be inevitably drawn into the next great war as in the last. Some people build confident hope upon it. But every phase of this picture should harden our resolves that we keep out of other people's wars. Nations in Europe need to be convinced that this is our policy.

Yet we are interested, vitally interested, in peace among other nations. The League of Nations, except as a most useful clearing house of economic and social information, is at least in a coma. Certainly the central idea that peace could be imposed by collective action employing military or economic force, is dead.

But these ideas of collective action now appear in a new form. I find in many quarters of Europe and some in America an insistence that, as democracy is endangered by the rise of dictatorships and authoritarian governments, therefore democracies should join in some sort of mutual undertaking for protective action. These ideas were greatly stimulated and encouraged by the word quarantine from these shores. Such

proposals, if sincere, involve more than mere good words. Anything honest in that direction implies the pledge of some sort of joint military or economic action by the United States with other powers. We may as well be blunt about it.

If we join with the two other powerful democracies, Great Britain and France, we are engaging ourselves in an alliance directed against Germany and Italy and all the satellites they can collect. But we are doing more than this. Great Britain has her own national and imperial problems and policies. Any commitment of ourselves will mean that we are dragged into these policies. France has her own special alliances and her own policies, including an alliance with communist Russia. We would be supporting Stalin.

But more than all this, we would be fostering the worst thing that can happen to civilization, that is, the building up of a war between government faith or ideologies. Such a combination of democracies would at once result in combining the autocracies against the democracies. It could have all the hideous elements of old religious wars.

We should have none of it. If the world is to keep the peace, then we must keep peace with dictatorships as well as with popular governments. The forms of government which other peoples pass thru in working out their destinies are not our business. You will recollect we were once animated by a desire to save the world for democracy. The only result that time was to sow dragons' teeth which sprang up into dictatorships. We can never herd the world into the paths of righteousness with the dogs of war.

While we should reject the whole idea of pledging our military or economic forces to any scheme for preserving peace by making war, we have both the obligation and the interest to organize and join in the collective moral forces to prevent war.

I know I will be told again that moral forces do not weigh much in a world of soldiers and battleships. But the greatest force for peace is still the public opinion of the world. That is a moral force. I will be told again that it

has no weight. But I found everywhere an anxiety for the approval of world opinion. Every consequential nation supports at great expense a propaganda bureau for that purpose. The dictatorships especially devote themselves to it.

And why? Because the desire of nations for the good opinion of mankind is not dead. Secretary Hull's eloquent denunciation of international lawlessness was echoed in every newspaper in the world. Decency is still news.

I believe there are methods by which the moral forces for peace and international cooperation for progress could be better organized than they are today. At this moment of despair in the world the problems of armament and economic degeneration press dreadfully for solution.

There is a measure for very modest but long-view action by our government that could bring great benefits to us and to other nations. It would serve to reduce greatly the area of frictions upon our war debt problem. After the armistice we established credits for reconstruction and food to Poland, Belgium, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Greece, Rumania and Yugoslavia. Only Finland has staunchly maintained these payments. The others are awaiting the action of the large war debtors. There are likely to be difficulties over these matters for years to come.

I believe we should consider suggesting to these relief credit countries as distinguished from the war credit countries a readjustment of the debts and—

That each of them make these payments into a fund in their own countries in their own currencies.

That this fund be used for extension of higher education, scientific research and for scholarships in their own universities; also for exchange of post-graduate students, professors and scientific information between the United States and that country.

That these funds are to be administered jointly by Americans and their nationals.

There will thus be created a joint interest with us from which we will generate benefits far greater than we will

otherwise receive. The cumulative effect over the years of building up a great body of influential men and women in those countries who would understand our country and believe in us would count greatly both in economic relations and in times of international emergency. And we shall have made a contribution to civilization which may be of no quick material value but which will serve as a great monument to our foresight.

In summary, in the larger issues of world relations, our watchwords should be absolute independence of political action and adequate preparedness. That course will serve the world best. It will serve our interests best. It will serve free men best.

In the field of international business we have much to think about. The prosperity of nations is the best antidote for the poisons of fear and hate. But that prosperity will be sadly limited as long as the present barriers to trade continue. They grow worse every month, and they directly affect our American workers and farmers every week.

I must amplify what I have already said as to these barriers. In these present day barriers the old-fashioned tariff plays but a minor part. The infinitely more potent system of quotas, exchange restrictions and internal control of the buyer, erects a solid wall against imports. This wall is opened only thru government-controlled gates, for specified commodities from specified countries. It matters little how low the tariff of a foreign nation may be if our American producers cannot obtain permission to move goods thru the gates of the quota or to obtain payment in our own currency for the goods. Nor are these new barriers limited to the despotisms. They are increasingly in use in European democracies as well.

At this moment our exports to over 300,000,000 people in Europe meet barriers far more potent than tariffs. And to another 200,000,000 they are partly controlled outside of tariffs. These additional trade barriers now affect nearly half of the world's commerce.

When we examine these barriers we find they have developed both offensive and defensive characteristics. Their main purpose is to force self-sufficiency in internal production. That is partly a measure of military defense. It is partly a measure to solve money exchange difficulties arising from unbalanced foreign trade and unbalanced budgets with their unstable currencies. Moreover, when governments undertake planned economy by managed currency production, wages and prices they must also control both imports and exports.

In other words, one of the consequences of planned economy is to place foreign trade more and more in the hands of the government. Thus this part of world commerce is steadily degenerating into one more implement of military and political policy.

Equal treatment of nations has been largely abandoned under these new devices. Quotas are being assigned between nations for other considerations, such as political affinity or credit advantages. For instance, the quota for automobile tire imports recently has been traded around among European nations almost to our total exclusion. I fear the reciprocity treaties in mutual lowering of tariffs will work out a one-way road under the practices of these new barriers. Some part of our workers and farmers who have been accustomed to produce goods for export are going to be out of a job so long as these practices last.

There are four alternative courses. We can, in an effort to ameliorate our situation, put penalties on the shipment to us of goods from countries whose practices in these ways discriminate against our goods. Or we could take advantage of our vast resources and by more protection establish some self-containment of our own. Or we can resume the fundamental approach to world sanity and trade peace by international cooperation as planned for the conference of 1933. Or we can make up our minds to keep a part of our people on relief for a long time.

My own conviction is that the world muddle of unstable currencies has more to do with the maintenance of these artificial trade barriers than any other one factor. If the problem is to be corrected fundamentally on an international scale, it must be approached ultimately at this point.

It is probable that courageous discussion and action among a group of nations might be an entering wedge to the jam of barriers. Gradually the trade of the world might be re-established from such a nucleus. And these questions are not economic abstractions. They create or destroy the jobs and the happiness of millions of our people.

The third of our attitudes which I wish further to discuss is our American relationship to the vast ferment of new and old social philosophies which boils furiously thruout the world. The wholesale eclipse of democracy must concern us. Our national mission is to keep alight the lamp of true liberalism. But it is in the United States that we must keep it alight.

Every few centuries the world gives birth to a new system of government and life. Or it resurrects old systems under new phrases. In any event, they mostly revolve around two old and diametrically opposed concepts—that the development of the individual is the prime purpose of the State or the individual is the pawn of the State. On one hand the individual possesses rights and on the other he does not; in the one concept the State is the organized expression of the will of individuals within it, in the other the individual is but the transient property of the State.

True liberalism is not a mere middle ground between fascism and socialism. Both fascism and socialism hold to the other concept—that the individual is but the pawn of an all-wise, omnipotent State. Liberalism has no compromise with either of these two forms of the same concept.

Let no man believe in either of two popular misapprehensions so widespread in this country today. This philosophy of communism is not imposed, suddenly, new born, from the bottom up. And this thing called fascism is not imposed,

suddenly, new born, from the top down. Both grew in prepared soils. Both are the aftermath of a gradual infection of democracy, a gradual perversion of true liberalism.

And let me again repeat that democracies are first infected by the plausible notions of "cure the business slump" through so-called economic planning. Every step in this direction requires another. Every step further demoralizes free economy. And step by step more force and coercion must be applied until all liberty—economic and personal and political—is lost.

Let no man mistake that we in America have until now avoided the infection of these European systems. If our own so-called planned economy is not an infection from the original stream of fascism it is at least a remarkable coincidence.

The leader of German fascism in a speech last week hurled the taunt to democracies that "not a single decent nation has died for the sake of democratic formalities." To the extent that races do not actually die because they forfeit individual liberty, that may be true. But what is far more important is that when true liberty dies then justice and truth die. And intellectual progress and morality die also.

I have no doubt that fascism will fail some time, just as Marxian socialism has failed already. The stifling of intellectual progress, the repression of the spirit of men, the destruction of initiative and enterprise will offset all the efficacies of planned economy. Even economic life cannot succeed where criticism has disappeared and where individual responsibility is constantly shirked for fear of the State. Even in fascist countries liberal ideas are not dead and will not be downed. Every despotism today lives with fear of liberty at its heart—or there would be no concentration camps.

And I may add that, having listened in many countries to eulogies of planned economy and fascism and of their benefits to the common man, I detected in every case the hope that some day liberty might return. The spirits of Luther, of Goethe, of Schiller, of Mazzini and Garibaldi are not dead.

Moreover there has been nothing shown me in Europe in elimination of wastes or better housing or security to workers or farmers or old age that we cannot do better under democracy if we will. Though I had little need for confirmation in my faith, I pray God that this nation may keep its anchors firmly grounded in intellectual liberty and spiritual freedom. These values can be preserved only by keeping government from the first pitfall of direction or participation in economic life—except that it shall sternly repress, by due process of law but not by edict, every abuse of liberty and honesty.

The protection of democracy is that we live it, that we revitalize it within our own borders, that we keep it clean of infections, that we wipe out its corruptions, that we incessantly fight its abuses, that we insist upon intellectual honesty, that we build its morals, that we keep out of war.

That is the greatest service that this nation can give to the future of humanity.

GERMANY TAKES AUSTRIA¹

BOAKE CARTER

This broadcast was given on Friday, March 11, 1938, at 6:30 o'clock, Eastern standard time, over the Columbia Broadcasting System. Carter is said to have a potential radio audience of 50,000,000. Columbia Broadcasting officials believe he has "a regular nightly audience of from ten to sixteen millions." His daily syndicated articles have a "newspaper audience of more than 7,000,000."

He speaks with a British accent. The public, in spite of an effort of radio officials to curb him, have welcomed his frank opinions.

Hello everybody! Post Toasties time! Boake Carter speaking!

Well, Chancellor Schuschnigg of Austria gambled—and lost. Hitler, stumped at first by the unexpected move of the Austrian Chancellor, today handed him an ultimatum—which was, in effect,—"Resign or take the consequences."

To back up the ultimatum, German troops were sent across the Austrian borders. German planes, the cables reported, flew over Vienna, providing an additional threat. Schuschnigg realized that he had lost his gamble. Rather than try to bluff thru and turn Austria into a battlefield, he resigned. He told Austrians that the ultimatum had forced his resignation. Into his shoes stepped the Minister of the Interior, Arthur Say-ess Inquart, a pro-Nazi. Promptly the new Chancellor rescinded half a dozen of the old Schuschnigg decrees, one of which was an old order banning the wearing of Nazi uniforms. In addition, he ordered the Austrian army to remain quiet and take no retaliatory action against any German troops who might have stepped over the frontier line. The plebiscite for Sunday was called off,

¹ By permission of the author.

and Schuschnigg announced that he was leaving Austria immediately to go into exile.

This swift turn of events turned Austrian Nazi demonstrations of anger into victory parades. These same events caused worryment, though no acute anxiety in London or Paris. German Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, in London, spent all morning trying to reassure British Government heads that no war was in the offing, and then boarded a plane to rush back to Germany. The German Ambassador to France called on Leon Blum, while the latter was in the midst of trying to form a new French Government. Both men assured both governments that Berlin had no intention of going any further than forcing events so as to push Schuschnigg out of the picture, and to see, by indirect means, that Austrian Nazis would be free to install their own man in the premiership, in accord with the recently made agreement between the two Teutonic nations.

There are some points worthy of thinking about carefully in light of this swiftly-moving drama in central Europe. First we note that they have provoked black headlines, which upon initial scanning, would lead one to believe from this side of the Atlantic that Europe is on the verge of a war. It is my belief that war is nowhere near Europe, that these events are what might be called surface rashes due to fundamental readjustments. Pimples of adolescence, one might say! Europe is in the stage of passing from the Utopian era of childhood of the past 20 years to the maturity of realities. Probably we shall see plenty more disturbances in the coming months as this process goes on, but war? It is extremely doubtful. And why? First, virtually every veteran diplomat and statesman in Europe has written off Austria long ago. Many of them were amazed when the Anschluss was prevented some years ago, and called it simply postponing the day when such a union would come about. Austria and Germany are both Teutonic; their customs and social outlooks are much alike. They have been neighbors for centuries and in the last war, Allies. The Treaty of Versailles established

an unnatural situation. Austria became a stomach without a mouth. For her very existence she was obliged to depend upon forced financial feeding from the British and the French bankers. The beginning of the end was in sight when the Credit-Anstalt bank collapsed several years ago and the French and British financiers were rowing with one another—say tit to you and tat to you! Conditions as unnatural as this could not last forever. Statesmen of Europe have long realized it and that is why they wrote off Austria. They look upon these events of the last few days as part and parcel of that process of European nations now taking the disagreeable sulphur and molasses that our mothers used to give us in spring-time to clear out our systems after a long winter.

In spite of disturbances, the long range peace prospects of Europe appear to be, not growing worse, but rather the opposite, improving. For responsible statesmen of Europe neither want war, nor can afford one, nor dare risk one. Therefore, they are striving to prevent one. And inasmuch as this situation is true of not one, but all European countries today and at this time, we should not be thrown off the track by scare headlines. To be sure and admittedly this process of readjustment to realism won't be easy. There'll be a lot more pimples break out in rashes here and there. But underlying the pimples, the progress toward a steadier peace in Europe, to me, is stronger today than at almost any time recently.

This, in turn, affects us. For it may invalidate the gloomy prognostications of some of our highest officials who have been saying that war is just around the corner and therefore we must have a huge increase in armaments. A couple more points are worth noticing in this Austrian-German family row affair. Do you notice that Switzerland is plumb right in the middle of the muddle? And yet we don't hear anything about Switzerland about to be taken over. We find she still retains her independence, even as she retained it all thruout the five years of the world war raging around her on every side. Yet she has strong minorities within her borders, Italians, Germans, French and others. The answer is the Swiss are smart

people. They figure they can live longer and at peace, if they mind their own business. They don't send a continual stream of notes to their neighbors suggesting that this and that nation ought to be quarantined. And likewise the Swedish, the Norwegians and the Danes, also close to the scene of action, seem to be paddling along nicely and quietly. One sees no notes flying forth from any one of these three. They are not spending much of their time suggesting punitive action for someone else. They just tend to their own knitting, and yet they are in the middle of the whole business. How much less excuse have we, separated by two oceans and thousands of miles removed from the scene, to be telling all the neighbors that if they don't like the way we think they ought to live and under what systems we think it best they should live, we'll come dashing over to teach 'em how! So the scare-heads may be large and black tonight, but don't be thrown by them. The story is not as bad as they would make out, and veteran European statesmen of London and Paris are the ones who so say. And being old hands at this game, they should know. The only ones they do fear are the World Savers brigade, who in their fanatical desire to put the world straight are the ones most likely to start a war.

VICTORY DINNER ADDRESS¹

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

This talk was given at the Democratic victory dinner at the Mayflower hotel, in Washington, D C, on March 4, 1937. In his message to Congress on February 5, Roosevelt asked from Congress power to appoint six justices to the Supreme Court, if those over seventy did not resign. A country-wide debate, in Congress, over the radio, before many organizations, followed. Mass meetings and radio broadcasts multiplied. Senators LaFollette, McKellar and Robinson led the defense of the proposal. Senators Borah, Johnson and Wheeler directed the opposition. When the case seemed to hang in the balance, the President appealed from Congress to the country in this nation-wide radio address. Senator Norris said, "It was the best speech Mr. Roosevelt ever made."

The Senate struggled for weeks. Various compromise measures were introduced. The Senate Judiciary Committee began hearings. Chief Justice Hughes in a letter insisted that the Court was "fully abreast of its work." The Court, in its minimum wage decision, in the Frazier-Lemke act decision, and in the decisions on the Wagner act, was decidedly liberal.

Senator Robinson, working for a compromise bill, died suddenly on July 14. The Senate then voted, 70 to 20, to return the original bill to the Judiciary Committee "whence it never again will emerge."

On this fourth of March, 1937, in millions of homes, the thoughts of American families are reverting to the March 4th of another year. That day in 1933 represented the death of one era and the birth of another.

At that time we faced and met a grave national crisis. Now we face another crisis—of a different kind but fundamentally even more grave than that of four years ago.

Tonight I want to begin with you a discussion of that crisis. I shall continue that discussion on Tuesday night in a nation-wide broadcast and thereafter, from time to time, as may be necessary. For I propose to follow my custom of

¹ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 81. No. 45. p. 2438-39. March 7, 1937. By permission of the author.

speaking frankly to the nation concerning our common problems.

I speak at this victory dinner, not only as the head of the Democratic party but as the representative of all Americans who have faith in political and economic democracy.

Our victory was not sectional. It did not come from compromises and bargains. It was the voice of 27,000,000 voters—from every part of the land.

The Democratic Party, once a minority party, is today the majority party by the greatest majority any party ever had.

It will remain the majority party so long as it continues to justify the faith of millions who had almost lost faith—so long as it continues to make modern democracy work—so long and no longer.

We are celebrating the 1936 victory. That was not a final victory. It was a victory whereby our party won further opportunity to lead in the solution of the pressing problems that perplex our generation.

Whether we shall celebrate in 1938, 1940 and in 1944, as we celebrate tonight, will deservedly depend upon whether the party continues on its course and solves those problems.

And if I have aught to say it will continue on its course and it will solve those problems.

After Election Day in 1936, some of our supporters were uneasy lest we grasp the excuse of a false era of good feeling to evade our obligations. They were worried by the evil symptom that the propaganda and the epithets of last summer and fall had died down.

Today, however, those who placed their confidence in us are reassured. For the tumult and the shouting have broken forth anew—and from substantially the same elements of opposition. This new roar is the best evidence in the world that we have begun to keep our promises, that we have begun to move against conditions under which one-third of the nation is still ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed.

We gave warning last November that we had only just begun to fight. Did some people really believe we did not mean it? Well, I meant it, and you meant it.

A few days ago a distinguished member of the Congress came to see me to talk about national problems in general and about the problem of the judiciary in particular.

I said to him:

John, I want to tell you something that is very personal to me—Something that you have a right to hear from my own lips. I have a great ambition in life.

My friend pricked up his ears.

I went on:

I am by no means satisfied with having twice been elected President of the United States by very large majorities. I have an even greater ambition.

By this time my friend was sitting on the edge of his chair.

I continued:

John, my ambition relates to January 20, 1941.

I could feel just what horrid thoughts my friend was thinking. So, in order to relieve this anxiety, I went on to say:

My great ambition on January 20, 1941, is to turn over this desk and chair in the White House to my successor, whoever he may be, with the assurance that I am at the same time turning over to him as President a Nation intact, a Nation at peace, a Nation prosperous, a Nation clear in its knowledge of what powers it has to serve its own citizens, a Nation that is in a position to use those powers to the full in order to move forward steadily to meet the modern needs of humanity—a Nation which has thus proved that the democratic form and methods of national government can and will succeed

In these coming years I want to provide such assurance. I want to get the nation as far along the road of progress as I can. I do not want to leave it to my successor in the condition in which Buchanan left it to Lincoln.

My friends, that ambition of mine for my successor can well be the serious ambition of every citizen who wants his United States to be handed down intact to his children and grandchildren.

I spoke in the dead earnestness of anxiety; I speak to you tonight in the same earnestness. For no one who sees as a whole today's picture of this nation and the world can help but feel concern for the future.

To the President of the United States there come every day thousands of messages of appeal, of protest, of information and advice, messages from rich and poor, from business-man and farmer, from factory employe and relief worker, messages from every corner of our wide domain.

Those messages reflect the most striking feature of the life of this generation—the feature which men who live mentally in another generation can least understand—the ever-accelerating speed with which social forces now gather headway.

The issue of slavery, for example, took at least forty years—two generations—of argument, discussion and futile compromise before it came to a head in the tragic war between the states.

But economic freedom for the wage-earner and the farmer and the small businessman will not wait, like emancipation, for forty years. It will not wait for four years. It will not wait at all.

After the World war, there arose everywhere insistent demands upon government that human needs be met. The unthinking, or those who dwell in the past, have tried to block them. The wise who live in the present have recognized their innate justice and irresistible pressure—and have sought to guide them.

In some countries, a royalist form of government failed to meet these demands—and fell. In other countries, a parliamentary form of government failed to meet these demands—and fell. In still other countries, governments have managed to hold on, but civil strife has flared or threats of upheaval persist.

Democracy in many lands has failed for the time being to meet human needs. People have become so fed up with futile debate and party bickerings over methods that they have been willing to surrender democratic processes and principles in order to get things done. They have forgotten the lessons of history that the ultimate failures of dictatorships cost humanity far more than any temporary failures of democracy.

In the United States democracy has not yet failed and does not need to fail. And we propose not to let it fail!

Nevertheless, I cannot tell you with complete candor that in these past few years democracy in the United States has fully succeeded. Nor can I tell you, under present circumstances, just where American democracy is headed nor just what it is permitted to do in order to insure its continued success and survival. I can only hope.

For as yet there is no definite assurance that the three-horse team of the American system of government will pull together. If three well-matched horses are put to the task of plowing up a field where the going is heavy, and the team of three pull as one, the field will be plowed. If one horse lies down in the traces or plunges off in another direction, the field will not be plowed.

What you and I call the principles of the New Deal did not originate on the 4th of March, 1933. We think of that date as their beginning, because it was not until then that the social demands they represented broke thru the inertia of many years of failure to improve our political and economic processes.

What were those demands and needs? How far did we succeed in meeting them? What about them today?

Ever since the World war the farmers of America had been beating off ever-mounting disasters. This administration tried to help them effectively where no other administration had dared to take that risk.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act testified to our full faith and confidence that the very nature of our major crops makes them articles of commerce between the States.

The AAA testified also to our full faith and confidence that the preservation of sound agriculture is essential to the general welfare—that the Congress of the United States had full constitutional authority to solve the national economic problems of the nation's agriculture. By overwhelming votes, the Congress thought so too!

You know who assumed the power to veto, and did veto that program.

In the campaign of 1936, I said:

Of course we will continue our efforts in behalf of the farmers of America. With their continued cooperation we will do all in our power to end the piling up of huge surpluses which spelled ruinous prices for their crops. We will persist in successful action for better land use, for reforestation, for better marketing facilities for farm commodities, for a definite reduction of farm tenancy, for encouragement of farmer cooperatives, for crop insurance and a stable food supply. For all these things we have only just begun to fight.

Neither individually nor as a party can we postpone and run from that fight on advice of defeatist lawyers. But I defy any one to read the majority opinion invalidating the AAA and tell us what we can do for agriculture in this session of the Congress with any reasonable certainty that what we do will not be nullified as unconstitutional.

The farmers were not the only people in distress in 1932. There were millions of workers in industry and in commerce who had lost their jobs, young people who had never been able to find their first job, and more millions whose jobs did not return them and their families enough to live on decently.

The Democratic administration and the Congress made a gallant, sincere effort to raise wages, to reduce hours, to abolish child labor, to eliminate unfair trade practices.

We tried to establish machinery to adjust the relations between the employer and employe.

And what happened?

You know who assumed the power to veto, and did veto that program.

The Railroad Retirement Act, the National Recovery Act and the Guffey Coal Act were successively outlawed as the child labor statute had been outlawed twenty years before.

Soon thereafter the nation was told by a judicial pronouncement that, altho the Federal Government had thus been rendered powerless to touch the problem of hours and wages, the States were equally helpless; and that it pleased the "personal economic predilections" of a majority of the

Court that we live in a nation where there is no legal power anywhere to deal with its most difficult practical problems—a no man's land of final futility.

Furthermore, court injunctions have paralyzed the machinery which we created by the National Labor Relations Act to settle great disputes raging in the industrial field and, indeed, to prevent them from ever arising. We hope that this act may yet escape final condemnation in the highest court. But so far the attitude and language of the courts in relation to many other laws have made the legality of this act also uncertain, and have encouraged corporations to defy rather than obey it.

In the campaign of 1936, you and I promised this to working men and women:

Of course we will continue to seek to improve working conditions for the workers of America—to reduce hours over-long, to increase wages that spell starvation, to end the labor of children, to wipe out sweatshops. We will provide useful work for the needy unemployed. For all these things we have only just begun to fight.

And here again we cannot afford, either individually or as a party, to postpone or run from that fight on advice of defeatist lawyers.

But I defy any one to read the opinions concerning AAA, the Railroad Retirement Act, the National Recovery Act, the Guffey Coal Act and the New York Minimum Wage Law, and tell us exactly what, if anything, we can do for the industrial worker in this session of the Congress with any reasonable certainty that what we do will not be nullified as unconstitutional.

During the course of the past four years the nation has been overwhelmed by disasters of flood and drought.

Modern science knows how to protect our land and our people from the recurrence of such catastrophes and knows how to produce as a by-product the blessing of cheaper electric power. With the Tennessee Valley Authority we made a beginning of that kind of protection on an intelligent regional basis. With only two of its nine projected dams completed

there was no flood damage in the valley of the Tennessee this Winter.

But how can we confidently complete that Tennessee Valley project or extend the idea to the Ohio and other valleys while the lowest courts have not hesitated to paralyze its operations by sweeping injunctions?

The Ohio River and the dust bowl are not conversant with the habits of the Interstate Commerce clause. But we shall never be safe in our lives, in our property or in the heritage of our soil until we have somehow made the Interstate Commerce clause conversant with the habits of the Ohio River and the dust bowl.

In the campaign of 1936 you and I and all who supported us did take cognizance of the Ohio River and the dust bowl. We said:

Of course we will continue our efforts—for drought and flood control—For these things we have only just begun to fight.

Here, too, we cannot afford, either individually or as a party, to postpone or run away from that fight on advice of defeatist lawyers. Let them try that advice on sweating men piling sandbags on the levees at Cairo.

But I defy any one to read the opinions in the TVA case, the Duke power case and the AAA case and tell us exactly what we can do as a national government in this session of the Congress to control flood and drought and generate cheap power with any reasonable certainty that what we do will not be nullified as unconstitutional.

The language of the decisions already rendered and the widespread refusal to obey law, incited by the attitude of the courts, create doubts and difficulties for almost everything else for which we have promised to fight—help for the crippled, for the blind, for the mothers—insurance for the unemployed—security for the aged—protection of the consumer against monopoly and speculation—protection of the investor—the wiping out of slums—cheaper electricity for the homes and on the farms of America.

You and I owe it to ourselves individually, as a party and as a nation to remove those doubts and difficulties.

In this fight, as the lawyers themselves say, time is of the essence. In three elections during the past five years great majorities have approved what we are trying to do. To me, and I am sure to you, those majorities mean that the people themselves realize the increasing urgency that we meet their needs now. Every delay creates risks of intervening events which make more and more difficult an intelligent, speedy and democratic solution of our difficulties.

As Chief Executive and as the head of the Democratic party, I am unwilling to take those risks—to the country and to that party—of postponing one moment beyond absolute necessity the time when we can free from legal doubt those policies which offer a progressive solution of our problems.

Floods and droughts and agricultural surpluses, strikes and industrial confusion and disorder cannot be handled forever on a catch-as-catch-can basis.

I have another ambition—not so great an ambition as that which I have for the country, but an ambition, as a life-long Democrat, I do not believe unworthy. It is an ambition for the Democratic party.

The party, and its associates, have had the imagination to perceive essential unity below the surface of apparent diversity. We can, therefore, long remain a natural rallying point for the cooperative effort of all of those who truly believe in political and economic democracy.

It will take courage to let our minds be bold and find the ways to meet the needs of the nation. But for our party, now as always, the counsel of courage is the counsel of wisdom.

If we do not have the courage to lead the American people where they want to go, some one else will.

Here is one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed—now!

Here are thousands upon thousands of farmers wondering whether next year's prices will meet their mortgage interest—now!

Here are thousands upon thousands of men and women laboring for long hours in factories for inadequate pay—now!

Here are thousands upon thousands of children who should be at school, working in mines and mills—now!

Here are strikes more far-reaching than we have ever known, costing millions of dollars—now!

Here are spring floods threatening to roll again down our river valleys—now!

Here is the dust bowl beginning to blow again—now!

If we would keep faith with those who had faith in us, if we would make democracy succeed, I say we must act—now!

THE SPIRIT OF THE REORGANIZATION BILL¹

CHARLES E. COUGHLIN

This broadcast on Sunday, April 3, 1938, was the third of a series, the first on March 27, the second on March 31, directed against the Administration's Reorganization Bill.

When fifteen months previously the President launched his Reorganization Plan for the Executive Department, the public was indifferent. When the bill appeared on the Senate floor in March, 1938, the press and public raised the question as to whether the proposal was not a move in the direction of establishing a dictatorship. The pastor of the Roman Catholic Shrine of the Little Flower at Royal Oak, Michigan, after each of the broadcasts, urged his listeners to send telegrams to their representatives. The wires to Washington were swamped. It was estimated that more than 200,000 telegrams poured in—a greater number than were sent when Father Coughlin in 1935 appealed for opposition to the World Court. According to Henry George Hoch, of the *New York Times*, "it was one of the greatest victories of his career." The bill passed the Senate, but was killed by the House (recommitted) by a vote of 204 to 196. The blow to the prestige of President Roosevelt was unquestionably heavy.

My friends and fellow citizens: I deeply appreciate that you expect me to review and comment upon the reorganization bill in today's broadcast. This proposed legislation has stirred the American public to its present passionate interest not because the provisions of the bill, in its present form, are definitely dictatorial but because of the circumstances which attended the presentation of the bill.

For your information the legislation now awaiting passage by the House of Representatives is almost substantially different from that which was proposed more than 15 months ago. At that previous date the reorganization bill and the judiciary reform bill, which appeared one month later on

¹ By permission of the author.

February 5, were so identical in government objective that most keen observers regarded them as twin bills submitted to Congress for the purpose of so amplifying the powers of the Chief Executive, that they would elevate him, for all practical purposes, over both Congress and the Supreme Court. In other words, those two original bills, almost 15 months old, would affect the construction of our peculiar American scheme of government.

Congress, the Supreme Court, and the Chief Executive are three branches independent of each other, altho correlated. As such they act as checks and balances upon each other. The law-making body, Congress, is prohibited from executing the laws. The executive, or Presidential branch, is restrained from making the laws, and the judiciary, or Supreme Court section of government, is limited to interpreting the laws.

Consequently, any proposed legislation tending to destroy the independence of any one branch of government; any legislation aimed at elevating any one branch to a position superior to the two remaining branches, is contrary to the traditions of Americanism and to the spirit and letter of our Constitution.

The foregoing statement is most necessary when considering the implications of the reorganization bill.

Fifteen months ago the twin bills to which I referred definitely aimed at destroying the checks and balances of our triply divided form of government. The original reorganization bill proposed removing specific powers from Congress and allocating them to the President. The judiciary bill, which was publicized one year ago last February, was designed to give the Chief Executive specific and immediate control over the personnel of the Supreme Court. Ever since that date the minds of watchful Americans were disturbed at the prospect of dictatorship, as some chose to characterize it, or at the danger of unbalanced government, as an erudite judge described it.

Because the second bill related to the Supreme Court was discussed first in Congress, the Nation's attention was concentrated upon it. But the national mind, thru some accident

of circumstances, failed to remember the relationship of this specific proposed legislation to its twin which was related to the reorganization of Congress. As a matter of history, the Supreme Court bill failed to pass on the Senate floor. Then came a long silence. The strategy of those who at that time were bent upon destroying the independence of both branches of our Government was associated with the theory that time is a healer of wounds and an opiate to the memory. Thus it was only recently—within the last month or so—that the reorganization bill regained public attention. During the months of February and March of this present year it was considered in a Senate committee and finally came before the entire body of Senators to be discussed. As a result of these considerations and discussions, the original reorganization bill was so substantially altered that no honest critic could maintain that in its final form it destroyed the independence of Congress.

Passing from the Senate to the House of Representatives last week, the reorganization bill created acrimonious discussion. No later than last night its sponsors, moved by hundreds of thousands of telegrams, which effectively split the Democratic Party, made two very important concessions to the opposition. Surmising that Mr. Harry Hopkins would be the new Secretary of Welfare, knowing that this gentleman was a registered Socialist in New York City, millions of Americans were disturbed when they envisioned this gentleman's having charge of the administration of all existing Federal laws relative to education. Being practical minded to the extent that we appreciated how an unsympathetic administrator can pervert even a good law, this possibility—yes, probability—of Mr. Hopkins being appointed to the executive office set in motion a flood of telegrams protesting against the inclusion of educational laws under his department.

Today the administration of Federal educational laws, so the administration promises, will remain in the Department of the Interior and will not be transferred under the jurisdiction of the Department of Welfare.

To gain much of his partisan support, which is seriously wavering, Mr. Roosevelt, it is reported, indicated last night that he was agreeable to a second amendment to the reorganization bill which will give Congress the right to override by a majority vote any action taken by the President under the bill's provisions. Until yesterday the bill provided that it would require a two-thirds majority of Congress to nullify the Presidential action under this bill.

Consequently, by yielding on these two points the Government's chances for the passage of the reorganization bill have been enhanced considerably. Tremendous opposition is still current both in Congress and in the Nation against the passage of the reorganization bill, not for what it is, or for what it provides at the present moment, but because of its original spirit which attempted, concurrently with the Supreme Court bill, to despoil Congress and the judiciary of their independence.

Now, let us turn to the future as it relates to the reorganization bill. It is my opinion that the proponents of this new bill will gladly concede on the floor of the House any amendment proposed in order to secure passage of the bare title of the reorganization bill. In no sense do I imply that this is a victory for the proponents. In no sense do I maintain that the amendments secured by Senators Wheeler, Byrd, Bailey, and Walsh, or the amendments promised yesterday in the House of Representatives will be sustained. These Senators and Representatives O'Connor of New York, Sweeney of Ohio, and Stack of Pennsylvania, and many other Congressmen have fought and will fight valiantly against the ultimate attempt to encroach upon our democratic institutions.

The reason for that statement is the following: Parliamentary procedure demands that once the House has passed even the bare title of the reorganization bill, denuded of every controversial paragraph and proposal, the House bill and the Senate bill will be placed together for discussion not by the Senate nor by the House, but by a New Deal, hand-picked group of conferees. These conferees are empowered by parlia-

mentary procedure to rewrite a new bill, to incorporate in it every proposal which had been stricken out either in the Senate or on the floor of the House and to rebuild it exactly as it was 15 months ago.

When this work will have been completed in joint conference, then the new reorganization bill will be presented to the House and to the Senate either for passage or for rejection. The Senators will not be permitted to debate it. The members of the House of Representatives will not be permitted to discuss it. Each body, in turn, will be permitted to vote for it or against it. Consequently, if the House of Representatives fails to defeat outright the entire reorganization bill during this week's session—and it is my honest opinion that the House will not be able to defeat it because of the multiple amendments which will be used to obtain support—then the New Deal conferees will wait patiently for 2 or 3 or 4 weeks until the public passion subsides. With lightning rapidity, the new bill will reappear before the Senate and the House for final passage before it will be possible for the people to reassemble their forces.

At that time my broadcast season will have terminated.

Therefore, the question at hand is this: "What contribution can I make to prevent the ultimate passage of the reorganization bill, provided it contains paragraphs and provisions which are obnoxious to democracy?"

This question I will answer at the conclusion of this broadcast this afternoon.

It is essential for all Americans to know that the reorganization bill from the beginning, and even now, limits the powers of the President to interchange functions of government from one department to another by a specific date. If the bill should pass, this power to be conferred upon the President will expire in 1940. But it is more essential to know that the changes which he makes between now and 1940 will remain permanent—so permanent that it would be impossible, practically speaking, for Mr. Roosevelt's successor in office, if there will be one, to restore government to its

original design. In other words, Mr. Roosevelt has power to scramble eggs according to his own decisions until 1940. His successor will try in vain to unscramble them.

It is also important to remember that as far back as the month of March, 1933, the President, who recognized that an emergency existed in the nation, asked and obtained from Congress emergency powers which permitted him to gain direct control over the purse of the Nation, and which allowed him to establish at least 56 corporations, such as the T. V. A., the H. O. L. C., and the A. A. A., the stabilization funds, etc., to function as depression destroyers.

Under the reorganization bill, which grants him power until 1940 to transfer the function of one department of government to another—and this permanently—these emergency powers will have entered permanently into the fabric of American life.

I believe it is more important to inform you of the strategy now being adopted by the sponsors of this bill and to prepare you for ultimate action than it is to magnify any one portion of the bill. Thus, I will not discuss at length that section of the bill which proposes to abolish the nonpartisan regulation of civil service and to place all civil-service employees under the dictatorship of a partisan agent removable from his office at will by the President.

It is sufficient to note that this legislation would establish the largest political pork barrel in all the world and would insure the perpetuation of a one-party form of government.

Nor shall I discuss the abolition of the Comptroller General's office because this portion of the bill is only incidental to its general bearing upon government and the nation. Permit me to engage your attention with some thoughts relative to the word, "emergency."

Government after government concerned themselves almost entirely with the problem of supply and of profit. Government after government disregarded the problem of demand and of consumption. As a result of all this the factories and the fields were well equipped to produce plenty. The laborers

and the farmers and their families, who comprised by far the major portion of the consuming power, could neither use nor consume the products of farm and factory because there was an insufficient purchasing power.

In 1933 it was evident that our nation was in the midst of an emergency. There were millions of men unemployed and thousands of factories closed. Homes and farms and industries were being confiscated as rapidly as government agents and mortgage holders could act.

Every intelligent person understood that this want amidst plenty had been promoted by an unsound credit inflation and a corresponding lack of purchasing power among the laboring and agricultural classes which were receiving less-than-living wages.

Thus, the emergency eventuated which demanded that the idle and impoverished be fed and clothed and sheltered. Thoughtful citizens recognized that the causes of the emergency must be eliminated before its effects would vanish.

For five years we have been living in the midst of an emergency psychology. For five years we have witnessed the inception of social reforms and have failed to recognize the establishment of the basic economic reform for which the times are clamoring. For five years we have experienced not a decrease but an increase in the causes of the emergency. More credit inflation has merely added to our national woes; more spending of debt money has merely deepened the roots of the emergency.

I fear that we have grown accustomed to the psychology of emergency. I fear that the millions of the unemployed, of the destitute, of the financially embarrassed have adopted as a permanent attitude the philosophy that the government must support the people. I fear that these same millions have rejected the sound principle that the people must support the government.

Year after year, session after session, Congress has satisfied its conscience with passing more emergency enactments, thereby solidifying in the minds of the millions the

permanency of this emergency. Year after year, the President, in good faith, I will admit, has given utterance to a most humanitarian philosophy: He has sympathized with the underfed third of the population of our nation; he has extended a friendly hand to exploited labor; he has been a firm advocate of unionism; he has been keenly interested in the welfare of agriculture. Altho he has been harsh and critical of monopolies and of industries, so have I; altho he has castigated the concentrators of wealth, so have I. However, it is my humble opinion, the major portion of his economic activities during the past five years have tended to make permanent the emergency.

With what result, psychologically speaking? While the taxpayers have suffered patiently in bearing the burden of bonds issued to extend doles and relief, they are growing impatient. While the dolesters themselves and the recipients of governmental subsidies at first were happy to receive an immediate assistance to tide them over an immediate crisis, they are growing dissatisfied because the little they receive is insufficient to maintain them on what they consider the American level of living.

Thus the flame of class hatred is leaping from the smouldering embers of discontent.

This, to my mind, is the fruit which has grown upon the tree of emergency psychology. It is the same psychology which has been perpetuated by the President and by Congress who bestowed upon him the temporary powers he requested in 1933—the same Congress which is about to confer upon him the authority to perpetuate these powers.

My friends, the hour has arrived for all of us to liquidate the emergency psychology which is devouring us.

Congress is aware that fifteen million persons are the regular recipients of doles and subsidies from the United States government. These persons are of voting age. They comprise men and women of the agricultural and the laboring classes. Is it the intent of Congress, imbued with an emergency psychology, to perpetuate these persons as wards

of the government, thereby as supporters of a one-party form of government?

Is it the purpose of Congress to surrender the proud spirit of Americanism which once spurned this so-called charity from the public purse—to surrender it to the cringing spirit of a servile state, thereby establishing, not the dictatorship of a one-man government, but the dictatorship of a one-party rule?

My fellow citizens, I repeat, the hour has struck for every proud American, be he rich or poor, employer or employee, congressman or layman, to unite for the destruction of this emergency psychology which has taken such deep root in the souls of approximately forty-five million of our citizens, and which promises, within the near future, to encompass more than half our population.

The principle that the government should support the people must be abandoned. The principle that the people must support the government must be re-adopted.

The attitude of Congress to concern itself with emergency legislation must be cashiered; for it is the business of Congress to apply its constitutional rights and duties in writing legislation which will terminate class struggle, class hatred and want amidst plenty.

Probably the advocates of the reorganization bill are waiting for me to call upon this audience and the American public to deluge the House of Representatives with more telegrams. That would be unsound strategy at this moment. This is not the time for sending more telegrams. It is inopportune. The messages which the hundreds of thousands of persons in this audience already have sent to Congress have had their salutary effect.

Now that the nation is aroused, the nation must not return to slumber. Now that vigilance is riding throughout every state in the Union, let vigilance continue to crusade.

Ladies and gentlemen, now that I have explained the procedure through which the reorganization bill must pass before it can be enacted into law, if ever; now that I have

touched upon the defeatist attitude of a government which, having failed to break the back of a depression, is venturing to perpetuate an emergency for the children and their children's children of future generations, our campaign extends to a more comprehensive scope. It is now about to grow into a campaign which will not be satisfied until, like St. George of old, its sword will have let out the last throb of life from the dragon of "emergency."

What, therefore, is the plan which I suggest and which, if acceptable, I ask every newspaper in this nation to print and propagate?

It is this: Beginning tomorrow I advocate that every congressional district in these United States shall organize a committee composed of intelligent, educated, judicious citizens. I propose that these committees, small in personnel, but versed in experience, shall be modern Paul Reveres whose business it will be to ride to Washington and arouse from slumber their respective representative and senator within the next two weeks.

I propose that these committees shall ask their congressman this one question and receive from him a definite answer:

Mr. Congressman, we are opposed to the reorganization bill because of the spirit which promotes it and because it is definite legislation to perpetuate an unnecessary emergency. We are opposed to a reorganization bill, not because it now appears innocuous, but because it indicates an abdication of power on the part of congressmen in favor of the President; because it is contrary in spirit, if not in deed, to the triple division of checks and balances instituted by the Constitution of our democracy

Therefore, tonight in our congressional district, while thousands of your constituents are massed in peaceful but public protest against the reorganization bill, we ask you this one question: Do you intend to be a congressman to represent your people under the Constitution or do you prefer to be a rubber stamp to pass any bill, including a reorganization bill, simply because our President requests it and do you plan to vote independent of patronage on all bills for the welfare of all the people instead of for the welfare of an individual party?

If the latter is your attitude, then there is no need of further inflicting a Congress upon the American people; if the former is your pledge to us, we will return home satisfied that the reorganization bill, or any other bill, aimed at perpetuating the emergency shall not pass.

My friends, this is my proposal at this juncture. I ask the editors of the various newspapers in the various localities to cooperate in establishing these committees.

If, and when, the new reorganization bill will emerge from the joint conference of Senate and House of Representatives, then will be the proper time to deluge Washington with another shower of telegrams and of letters protesting your opposition to such emergency measures when now is the time for America to turn its back on such policies and to stretch forth its hands to the saving anchor of democracy which we can make function if we will to do so.

We, the people, under God our Father, are called to arise and re-establish our authority.

This is not a religious issue. This is an issue between prosperity and democracy on the one side and emergency and partyism on the other.

Therefore, reviving the scriptural text which is applicable to all America in this crisis, I quote for you the words that the "letter killeth and the spirit maketh to live." And I interpret them for you to mean that it is not the letter of the reorganization law which matters in this instance. It is the spirit which predominates it, the spirit of centralization of power, the spirit of perpetuating a needless emergency, the spirit of defeatism which, like a cloak, is enshrouding the shoulders of America.

.

RISE OF PERSONAL GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES¹

WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. Lippmann delivered this speech before Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, on April 21, 1937. The speaker's wide reputation as a writer and journalist has been more and more supplemented by his activity as a speaker. This speech is one of the hundreds delivered during this period in analysis and protest of the Roosevelt government, and is to be interpreted in relationship to the criticism of New Deal legislation during the first months of 1937.

My subject this evening is the rise of personal government in the United States. I shall attempt to define the magnitude of this phenomenon, to diagnose its causes, and to indicate the remedies. But by way of introduction I wish to make it clear that I am not concerned with the character or with the purpose of the individual who happens to be the personal embodiment of this radically new form of government in America. I have known him for twenty years and I do not impute to him any sinister ambition whatsoever. His partisans in this audience may not believe that now, but before I have finished, I hope to persuade even them that I say this in all sincerity. For I believe it can be shown that the phenomenon we are witnessing has its roots in conditions that preceded by a long time the election of Mr. Roosevelt, and that democratic government had become too devitalized by its own failings to deal with the great social crisis of 1929-35. My thesis is that while Mr. Roosevelt had to assume extraordinary personal powers to deal with that emergency, there is the grave possibility that he is now engaged in perpetuating these extraordinary personal

¹ *Vital Speeches of the Day*. Vol. 3. No. 14. May 1, 1937. p. 418-23. By permission of the author.

powers and in habituating the American people to the practice of personal government. I do not believe, and I do not in any way mean to insinuate that Mr. Roosevelt seeks to perpetuate his own personal power beyond the four-year term to which he is elected. But I do believe that, if in these four years the habits of constitutionalism are destroyed, it may be very difficult to revive them.

In order to make clear the magnitude of the change we are witnessing, I shall recall to your minds the powers which the President has asked for in the last four years. Though he has not yet obtained all these powers, he has asked for all of them. I should like you to consider them, not separately, but as a whole. So far as I know he regards them all as the necessary and desirable powers of the President of the United States. They are a measure, therefore, of the scope and of the degree to which the President himself, the dominant party, and a very large part of the population, now approve the conception of personal government as an alternative to the traditional checks and balances of constitutional federalism.

It should be noted that tho most of these powers were asked and were granted originally for a limited period of one or two years on the ground of emergency, they are now treated as permanent elements of the personal political program of the President. All the powers I shall name are additional powers over and above those which by law and usage had previously belonged to the President.

He has asked Congress to delegate to him the power to frame laws, enforceable by penal and civil penalties, governing wages, hours, prices, the control of production, the use of new inventions, the legal right to do business, and the commercial practice of all industries, trades and services in the United States. This power was granted by Congress for a period of from one to two years. The power to license was, I think, voluntarily renounced at the end of one year. But all the other powers, in substance, the power to bring all

industry under Federal laws enacted by the President, have never been renounced.

I am not talking, mind you, about whether the objectives of N. R. A. were good or bad. I am talking about the fact that the National Industrial Recovery act called for a delegation of personal power by which the President, or his agents, could enact Federal laws affecting manufacturing, trade, the service industries, and to some degree even the arts and professions. Taken in conjunction with the powers granted in the Agricultural Adjustment act as they affected the processors of farm products, it may be said that the power to legislate for the whole economic organization of the United States was from 1933 to 1935 vested in the President of the United States. This power has been struck down by the Supreme Court. But the President has never deleted the demand for this power from his personal political program.

He has asked and obtained from Congress the delegation of its constitutional power to regulate the value of money, and that power is today exercised not by an independent monetary authority, but by his personal appointees. Now I have no doubt that Congress is unable to exercise directly its constitutional power to regulate the value of money, that a popular assembly is incapable of determining the correct price of gold or the proper volume of credit, or the desirable rate of interest, and that this power has to be delegated. All I am concerned with here is to point out that this crucial power over the incomes of every person has been delegated, not to an independent authority such as the Federal Reserve Board was designed to be, but to the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, as in effect, agents of the President.

He has asked and obtained the blanket power to distribute funds through what is in effect a special Presidential budget equal to the total budget of the government when he was inaugurated, and under legal powers which are virtually undefined, and when defined have in important respects been circumvented or ignored. By his own personal discretion

the President allocates to states, municipalities, government bureaus and to individuals several billions of dollars. He has used it to dig canals and to produce plays and to publish books and to finance political propaganda and even to strengthen the Army and the Navy. Some of these projects have been excellent. I am glad the Army and Navy have been strengthened in these troubled times. But I am concerned to point out that the historic rule that the representative assembly shall control the expenditure of public money, has been suspended in respect to about half the Federal budget.

He has asked, tho he has not yet been granted, the authority to reorganize and to redistribute the powers of the executive branch of the government. Considered on its merits, as a proposal made under the normal condition of effective checks and balances in the government, this seems to me in principle desirable. But in view of all the other powers which Mr. Roosevelt seeks to vest in the Presidency, it has a cumulative significance which cannot be ignored. It substitutes for the statutory organization of the executive branch of the government the personal organization of the President.

He has asked, tho he has not yet been granted, the authority to bring the quasi-judicial independent commissions within the administrative orbit of his own personally appointed Cabinet officers. While the intention to control the judicial functions of these commissions is denied, it is admitted that their administrative and executive functions are to be brought under the direction of the President.

He has asked, but has been denied by the Supreme Court, the power to dismiss members of these independent commissions whose views do not run with his own.

Thus he has asked Congress to delegate to him the legislative power over economic affairs, the legislative power of appropriation in respect to half the budget, the legislative power to define the statutory functions of the executive branch of the government, the administrative control of the independent quasi-judicial commissions, and he has asked the

Supreme Court, in the Humphrey case, to consent to his control over the personnel and over the opinions of the independent commissions.

In so far as Congress has consented to this colossal delegation of personal power, it was moved originally by a patriotic conviction that extraordinary measures were necessary to deal with an emergency and its scruples were satisfied by the assurance that these powers were for a limited period of time and for use in the emergency.

But since the summer of 1935, when the emergency had clearly been overcome, a new situation has arisen. By creating the most powerful political machine that has ever existed in the history of this country, the immense powers granted to the President for the emergency have been employed to perpetuate those powers. That machine is equipped with funds, with patronage, with the power to give and to withhold privileges in every community, down to the smallest hamlet in the land. In practically every state in the union it exercises the power of political life and death over governors, mayors, county officials, Senators and Representatives, and it controls by means of direct subsidies or favor of one kind and another large compact organized minorities in almost every constituency.

The Mayor of the City of New York, for example, is dependent directly upon Washington for the success of his own political career: without the grants, loans, and doles which come from Washington, he would be compelled either to practice a most unpopular economy or to impose most unpopular taxes. The same is true of the Governor of the State of New York, and I have no doubt it is true of most governors and most mayors. The net effect is that the local political organizations throughout the country have become subordinate branches of the President's personal political organization, and it is an exceptionally bold politician indeed who can stand out against it.

Thus the extraordinary powers delegated by Congress to the President have been used and are being used to pack the

Congress with men who would not dare, and in fact would not wish, to restore the normal balance of power between Congress and the President. To such a degree are we now living under a personally packed Congress that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate has publicly announced, as if it were very funny, that he has no convictions on any public question, and that he changes his deepest convictions when he is ordered to change them. To such a point has the personal domination of Congress been carried that the President actually attached to his message on the judiciary the text of the bill he requires Congress to pass.

That bill was introduced by a Congressman who never read it, and it now bears his name, and Senators who have dared to call their souls their own by opposing the bill have seen their own states invaded by the manager of the Presidential machine, and have had notice served on their local supporters, that the bill is a party measure and that opposition is disloyalty to the party.

Yet this party measure, which a Democrat can oppose only at the risk of his political life, is a direct violation of the platform adopted by the Democratic party last June. This party measure was decided on by the President personally after an election in which his spokesmen expressly denied that he intended to make such a proposal. It was adopted as a party measure without consulting the Cabinet or the party leaders in Congress, and though it would unquestionably be defeated if the Senators were free to vote their convictions, the attempt is being made to drive it thru by the overwhelming pressure of the Presidential machine. Thus the personal decision of one man has become superior to the pledges adopted by the representative assembly of his own party, and Senators who remain true to the pledges of their own party are treated as rebels who are to be punished.

The avowed objective of this measure is the domination of the only remaining independent branch of the government. The judiciary bill is not a proposal to amend the Constitution. It is not a proposal to restrict or to regulate the power

of judicial review. It is not a proposal to provide for the regular retirement of justices and the regular infusion of younger judges. It is a proposal to vest in this President the power to make six personal appointments. Under this bill if Mr. Roosevelt appointed six men no older than Mr. Justice Story, who ascended the bench at the age of thirty-two, the majority of the court would represent the personal philosophy of one man for nearly forty years.

And what is the personal philosophy of that one man? What is to be the constitutional philosophy of the six new judges? It is to be, as we learned in Mr. Roosevelt's fireside chat, that the general welfare clause of the Constitution should give the Federal government authority to do whatever it deems desirable for the general welfare. Thus we are confronted with a proposal to make a new Supreme Court which will be dominated by judges who believe that the Federal government has power to do anything which Congress considers conducive to the general welfare. This is no proposal to liberalize the court. For no liberal justice has ever believed that the general welfare clause means what Mr. Roosevelt says it means, that it is a blanket grant of power. This is a proposal to suspend the very essence of constitutional government. For any one can read anything he likes into the phrase "general welfare," and so in place of a Federal government of limited powers, we are asked to consent to a government in which the ruling majority of Congress, as directed by the President, is sovereign without limitations in American affairs.

I ask you to consider this program as a whole and to ask yourselves soberly and searchingly whether it must not be described as the decline of democracy and the rise of personal government. I know that the President and his partisans say that they have a mandate from the people, that they carried forty-six states and polled 27 million votes. But I say that they have no mandate from the people for this program, that they never disclosed it to the people, that they were careful not to submit it to the people, and that this can be

proved by the record. They were asked during the campaign whether they intended to revive the N. R. A. When the President's son was reported as saying that they intended to do this, the reports were denied. They were asked whether they intended to seize control of the Supreme Court. The chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee indignantly denied it. When they went before the people from June to November they gave the voters to understand that the emergency was virtually passed, and that the reforms of the second Administration would be carried out under the normal checks and balances of the American political system. It is only since the election that we have learned that the whole collection of emergency powers are to be revived and perpetuated by overthrowing the resistance of the Supreme Court. And we are told that this epoch-making change in the basic character of the government is to be carried out by a margin of eight or ten votes obtained from Senators who do not dare to vote as they believe. That, ladies and gentlemen, is not American democracy as we have known it. It is a bloodless, deviously legalized *coup d'état*.

The implications of this change are as yet understood only by a minority of the American people, and I have no doubt that the President's supporters are right when they tell us that a sizeable majority of the voters are quite content with it. That does not seem to me a sufficient excuse. I do not think that the popularity of the man is a good enough reason for changing the fundamental character of a government. For I hold it to be the duty of public men to guard the institutions of their country, and not to induce the people to consent, unwittingly and without full consideration, to deep and fundamental changes in their national life.

To vest virtually unlimited powers, hitherto reserved to the states, in the Federal government, to delegate those powers to the President and to nullify judicial review is, in fact, a radical change in the inner substance of the American government. While this change may be popular for a time, the day is bound to come when the people will need the

protection of their institutions, only to find to their dismay that those institutions no longer exist.

Suppose it were true that Mr. Roosevelt is capable of exercising the personal supremacy which his program calls for. What of it? Do we have any assurance that all his successors will be as benevolent as he is? If such power is to be concentrated in the President—the power of the states, the legislative power of Congress, the power of the purse, and the judicial power, is there any doubt that to possess such transcendent power must become the fierce and intransigent and dominating ambition of our whole political existence? For such great power as that, men, factions, parties, regions and classes will fight to the bitter end. This is the road to hell, and while there is no doubt that it is paved from one end to the other with good intentions, Americans have always had the political wisdom jealously to refuse to concentrate supreme power in any man or in any branch of government.

I said at the outset that I do not regard this swift and far-reaching development of personal government as something deliberately conceived by sinister ambition. Though I think it is shocking that the Administration does not see the dangers and change its course, I am entirely convinced that the moving cause is not personal ambition and that there is no taint of conspiracy in it. I ascribe the development to a sincere progressivism in men who have lost their constitutional bearings during a great social crisis, and have now become so enchanted with the end that they no longer consider the means.

The question we must ask ourselves is why the American political system proved to be so inadequate in the crisis that sincere and loyal men feel that they have to consent to this profoundly un-American kind of personal government. The answer to that, I think, is that all the organs of American government had become seriously devitalized and impaired before the crisis broke, and that is why we have fallen into personal government.

We may begin with the Executive. Over a generation, but particularly since the war, the function of the Executive has been greatly enlarged and greatly complicated. These new functions called for a trained and unpolitical Civil Service under a policy-making cabinet. But though we enlarged the function of government, we failed to develop the necessary Civil Service. The result of that has been that the department heads who make up the Cabinet have been so preoccupied with administration that they are unable to act collectively as makers of policy. The effect has been to concentrate in the President the whole burden of deciding policy. And since policy is inseparable from administration, the President has become personally responsible for the whole vast executive function. He does not really have colleagues. He has only subordinates, and the lines of authority all run loosely but directly to him personally. This is more personal power than any man can exercise. But the worst effect of it is to persuade the people, the politicians, and the President himself, that they must look to him for personal decisions on all important matters.

President Wilson, who was a deep student of government, did manage to delegate and fix responsibility outside himself. But President Hoover never understood that the executive power cannot be exercised by one man, and President Roosevelt has not understood it either. Mr. Hoover delegated almost nothing of importance, and he was overwhelmed by his responsibilities. Mr. Roosevelt does delegate. But rarely does he delegate to responsible officials. The policy-making function is exercised by informal advisers who are accountable only to the President personally. So far has this been carried that the only members of the Cabinet who can be said to exercise real responsibility are the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture. The policy of economic appeasement through the lowering of tariff barriers is Secretary Hull's policy, and Secretary Wallace is, I believe, in fact the prime mover in agricultural policy. But for the rest the President does not have any recognized responsible advisers on high

questions of public policy. His advisers are those whom he personally chooses to consult, those who happen from time to time to enjoy his personal sympathy. Thus no one thinks of the Secretary of the Treasury as the responsible adviser in fiscal policy, or of the Secretary of Commerce as the responsible advisor on policy toward business, or of the Attorney-General on matters of law. Above all, no one thinks of the Cabinet as having any collective responsibility. The advisers of the President are not the Cabinet, they are not even the responsible heads of the departments. They are individuals who have no responsibility except to the President personally.

Both because this system aggrandizes the individual who happens to be President, because it isolates him on an impossible eminence, and because it is so disorderly that only arbitrary decisions can untangle it, this method of governing prepares the rise of personal government. The remedy is the creation of a Civil Service presided over by a responsible cabinet which is the collective adviser of the President. The Executive is one of the coordinate branches of the government. But owing to the fact that the Civil Service is undeveloped and that the Cabinet has withered away, the executive power has become concentrated in the White House, and it is now regarded as the personal enterprise of the man who happens to be President.

The vitality of Congress has also been profoundly impaired, chiefly, I believe, because Congress has been intellectually corrupted by a false conception of the function of a representative assembly. This false conception goes back to the beginning. Congress has thought of itself as the initiator of laws, particularly of laws appropriating money and bestowing privileges, such as tariff rates and public works. But that is not the true function of a representative assembly. Its function, particularly in regard to money—and most legislation involves money—is to control expenditure, to grant, or to refuse to grant, the funds and the powers which the Executive asks. The principle was established more than

two hundred years ago in the English parliament. We have just begun to adopt it under the name of an executive budget.

An executive budget means that Congress can refuse or reduce the appropriations the Executive asks for, but that it cannot increase them, and that it cannot initiate new expenditures without imposing new taxes to cover them. Only under this system can an elected representative cease to be a broker between his constituents who want favors and those who have the power to dispense favors.

Until recent years the power to dispense favors has resided in Congress itself, and the standing of a representative with the politicians at home, and with organized self-seeking minorities, has depended upon his ability to wangle and log-roll material favors out of Congress itself. This task occupied so much of his energy that little was left for statesmanlike deliberation on public questions. It called for so many compromises of his convictions that he had ceased to be free to deliberate. The result was that statesmen could rarely hope to be nominated, and (if they devoted themselves to public matters) could rarely hope to be re-elected. By the law of the survival of the fittest, those who survived were those who served the pressure groups rather than the public interest.

In the crisis of 1932-33 the demoralization of Congress by pressure groups had reached a point where their discordant clamor had made Congress incapable of acting decisively in the national interest. Representative government was paralyzed and impotent, and since the emergency had to be dealt with, it became necessary to suspend the deliberative functions of Congress and to place Congress under the strict discipline of the President.

This had to be done because the preoccupation of individual Congressmen with patronage and privilege and subsidies had overwhelmed their function as members of representative assembly. In the midst of a crisis they had become incapable of acting as a coordinate branch of the government,

and under the spur of grim necessity they had to be made subordinate in order that they would cease to obstruct.

The restoration of the vitality of Congress can come only through a purge which will remove patronage and pork from Congressional control. That means a real Civil Service and a true executive budget. When Congressmen can no longer obtain patronage and pork, the kind of Congressmen who is an expert in obtaining patronage and pork, but is otherwise uninterested in public questions, will no longer be the politician who survives most successfully.

Finally, we must recognize that in the past fifty years the vitality of the states, as organs of a Federal system, has been deeply impaired. Their authority to regulate business and to provide social services has been so severely restricted by a line of decisions of the Supreme Court, that at last only the Federal government has seemed capable of exercising the police power. These decisions, generally under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, were inspired, I suppose, by a nationalist sentiment following the Civil war that the progress of the national economy must not be interfered with by local sovereignties. Since the Civil war the reaction against states' rights was extreme among the Republican judges, among the judges whose convictions had been formed in the struggle against slavery and disunion.

The balance of powers in a federal system is always a delicate one. In the reaction which followed the Civil war that balance was dangerously upset, and the Republicans who now proclaim the virtues of states' rights need to be reminded that they are responsible for the impairment of the majority of the states. Not until the dissenting justices, beginning with the great Holmes, began to speak, has the pendulum begun to swing back. It has been swinging back during the past ten years. Only now can it be said that the dissenters have become a bare and uncertain majority of the court. That task of reconstruction is, however, just begun, and if we are to escape the centralization of all powers in Washington, we cannot too quickly or resolutely restore the powers of the

states. In the meantime the dominant party in the United States is led by men who no longer believe that it is possible or desirable to restore the federal character of the government. The present Democratic leadership is as scornful of states' rights as were the radical Republicans in the generation after the Civil war, and once again the unhappy ghost of Thaddeus Stevens walks in the land. It must be admitted that the radical Republicanism of the post-Civil war period was provoked by the application of states' rights to the point where it disunited the nation. It must also be admitted that the radical Democracy of the New Dealers has been provoked by the cumulative frustration of the police power of the states.

Now it is easy enough to understand why progressive men who have been frustrated in their attempts at regulation and reform in the states should have lost patience with the federal system itself, and should be demanding what is in effect the abolition of federalism. But I hold that it is the duty of the President and of Congress not to let provocation determine their policy, and that the true remedy is the restoration of federalism, not its abolition. Thus, tho I am irreconcilably opposed to the proposed plan for reorganizing the federal judiciary, I am perfectly clear in my own mind that the court must overrule its own decisions where they rob the states of their police power.

For I am satisfied that the growing complexity of American economic life makes more necessary, not less necessary, a vitally efficient federal form of government. Just because the economy requires more regulation than it did a hundred years ago, it is impracticable and dangerous to concentrate the regulative power in one centralized government. For there remain, in spite of all the big national business corporations, decisive local differences in the standards of life, in the productivity of labor, in the efficiency of capital. It is impossible to fix one price or one wage rate or one rule about hours of labor for the whole United States. It is impossible to provide identical social services or to impose standardized educational requirements, or to insist upon the same commercial practices

thruout this continental domain. And while it is undoubtedly true that more of our affairs require national legislation than formerly, and that very many of them require more nearly uniform legislation, it is certain that if we did not have a federal system, we should have to reinvent it. Our real task is to restore it.

My conviction that federalism is not the obsolete doctrine from a horse-and-buggy age but is, on the contrary, a vital political principle for the future, is confirmed by what we see of the development of constitutionalism in Britain. In the horse-and-buggy age the government at Westminster was sovereign thruout the British Empire. Today in the age of the radio and electricity and the airplane, there are three autonomous parliaments in the British Isles, there is an autonomous federal system in Canada and another in Australia, there is an autonomous parliament in South Africa and in New Zealand, not to mention Egypt and India. So when I hear that federalism has been rendered obsolete by modern inventions and the evolution of big business, I am unconvinced. For what I see is that the latest constitutional developments of the freest people in the world is not away from but toward that very federal principle which we have inherited.

Not long ago, in fact just before the President's plan for reorganizing the Supreme Court was disclosed, Senator Borah made an eloquent speech saying that what the American people needed was to be rebaptized in the principles of constitutional liberty. To that I have tried to contribute this evening, first by recalling the degree in which constitutionalism has given away to personal government, and then by seeking to indicate the vital points at which the constitutional vitality of the Executive, of Congress, and of the separate states has been impaired.

It is not necessary, I think, to exhort this audience gathered in the Maryland Free State about how necessary constitutionalism is to the preservation of human dignity. You understand, and need not be told, that men can live with dignity and security only under a constitutional government, and that per-

sonal government, however benevolent in intention, is in the end always arbitrary, capricious, corrupt, and impermanent. You have come to realize, I believe as I have, reluctantly, skeptically, but at last clearly, that we are faced—now—with the choice between the restoration of constitutional government and a rapid descent into personal government. And that now, before it is too late, we have to make our stand and fight for the fundamental liberties of the American people.

WHICH WAY IS PROGRESS?¹

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University, gave this address before the Graduate Club of Teachers College, Columbia University, May 2, 1937. It is typical of Dr. Butler's strong and scholarly utterances in promoting cooperation between nations. A month previously the University had paid tribute to the President on his seventy-fifth anniversary. On May 8th he was re-elected president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Throughout the year Dr. Butler continued his vigorous addresses on the topic of internationalism. He is rated one of America's ablest speakers on educational and political problems.

Any one who is looking out over the twentieth-century world and trying to find the moving forces which are underneath and behind the obvious appearances must, if he discusses these matters, from time to time frequently find himself saying the same thing over again. Just now I have been reading the confidential stenographic reports of some most extraordinary conversations and discussions among leaders of opinion in Europe as to what the happenings which are recorded from day to day really mean. The news we all get. But what is behind the news? What shapes it and causes it and guides it and gives it its significance? Those are the searching questions of this moment and particularly for those who, at the early stages of an active life, should look forward and do look forward to an understanding participation in the world's intellectual and social life.

In my judgment, the three most important books which have been written since the Great War are Spengler's *Decline of the West*, Ortega's *Revolt of the Masses*, and Pareto's *Mind and Society*. Spengler is a German and had conceived his

¹ *The Family of Nations*. p 313-22. Chas. Scribner's Sons. New York. 1938. By permission of the author and by special arrangement with the publishers.

book, and in part had written it, before the outbreak of the Great war. He published it as that war was approaching its end. Ortega, outstanding Spanish philosopher and man of letters, published his book some seven or eight years ago. Pareto, an Italian mind of the first rank, had been at work upon his book for many years, and the admirable translation of it in English made by our own associate and colleague, Professor Arthur Livingston, came from the press about two years ago. These three books have no obvious relation to the news. They do not reflect or discuss the news, but they are, to my thinking, the most important contributions toward an understanding of much that the news means. Both Spengler and Ortega are highly pessimistic. Pareto is less so, much less so, but nevertheless the critical reader will find ground in Pareto's pages for accepting some of the points of view, the pessimistic points of view, of Spengler and Ortega.

Ortega puts it very bluntly. He says that the commonplace man has become so commonplace and so numerous that he does not see any reason why the things that are commonplace should not be forced upon everybody whether they like them or not. His point is that the rule of the majority is fatal to intelligence and to progress and that the reason the world of today is going, as he thinks, downhill is that the commonplace has taken control.

Spengler's argument is more searching and more profound. He analyzes the history of the Western world from its beginnings and offers proof that it has for a long time past been going steadily on the rocks and that it has not much farther to go before these rocks are reached.

It is not easy in a short compass of time to discuss searching thoughts such as those, or to do more than indicate their importance and to emphasize the literary and philosophical authority by which they have been presented to the intellectual world during the past fifteen or twenty years. But I wish to fit them into an historical picture which perhaps will help us to understand what is really going on today.

In the Western world there have never been absent the desire and the ambition to unify it under single control. If we confine ourselves to the more familiar periods of history, we see first Alexander the Great moving his well-drilled and capable armies toward the East with a view to conquering and subduing and bringing under his administration what we now call Turkey and Syria and Arabia and Mesopotamia. He reached the confines of India, but he failed.

Next comes the Roman Empire, speaking thru those masters of law and administration and public works, the like of which in capacity, all things considered and the circumstances of that time being taken into account, the world has never seen. They extended that empire of theirs as far as the line between Edinburgh and Glasgow, as far as the Rhine and the Necker, and down in Africa to the Sudan, across in Asia to the Tigris and Euphrates. It began to look as if the world had been unified; as if the Roman law and the Roman administrative control would guide mankind in the West for an indefinite period of time. But human capacity as revealed in the lives of individuals proved unequal to that task, and the Roman Empire collapsed and fell.

For a time there was the imitative attempt of Charlemagne which resulted in the Holy Roman Empire, which existed on paper for a thousand years. Few of us remember that the Holy Roman Empire was only dissolved in the time of Napoleon Bonaparte, but as an effective instrument of government and human guidance and human control it had not been in real existence for many centuries. When the three sons of Charlemagne divided the Western world among them, nation-building began and nation-building is the clue to an understanding of the Western world from the time of Charlemagne to this day.

These ethnic unities have swept backward and forward, trying to define a new geographic unity and to control it. In early days, before modern means of communication and modern knowledge and modern science were at the service of man, the Rhine seemed to present a considerable limitation. Today,

the Rhine is a mere stream and can prevent nothing in the way of a great popular movement and could not possibly take the place of the Alps, the Pyrenees, the Adriatic, the Mediterranean, or the Atlantic as a limitation of a geographic unity. That is why these nation-building struggles have gone on from that day to this in what we call western and central and southeastern Europe.

When you come to nation-building, you find that the ambitions of men, which are the guiding forces at first, become multiplied in strength, as the years go on, by economic interests. In the older days, when life was simple and domestic, men did not move about for trade, for commerce or for industry. For a hundred and fifty years past that has not been true. Year by year conditions and circumstances have come into existence, and have increased and multiplied, which have made these nations, once seemingly so separate, wholly and completely interdependent in their own interest, even if they do not know and recognize it. Today the world is at the point where the effort of Alexander the Great having failed, the effort of the Roman Empire having failed, nation-building as a force having reached its limit, we must ask the question: What next? Is Spengler right? Nothing is next but decline, collapse, and the end of our civilization. Is Ortega right? Nothing is next but the rule of the commonplace and the revolt against intelligence? There are many signs to encourage Spengler and to encourage Ortega.

The most popular, the most successful, and the most widely heralded changes today are reactionary in the highest degree. Communism is hailed as progress by those who do not know that it is the state out of which we have been evolving since the earliest days of recorded man. We began as communists, and had we remained communists we should have today been where we began. The reason why we are where we are is that we have turned our back on that destructive, reactionary, and limiting habit in principle and have gone out to build a civilization based upon individual capacity, character, and achievement. When we are told by a Russian

philosopher that he is a radical, I for one must smile. He is, but he is also the world's chief reactionary. May he live to find it out!

The Nazi Socialists and the Fascists think that they are progressive. They have got a new idea, which is that the whole people should do as it is told by a dictator. For them it is not necessary to go back so far as in the case of communism; five hundred years will do, to the unlimited and despotic monarchs of that period who were the most admirable predecessors of the present-day captains of the Fascist and the Nazi philosophies and social organizations. You cannot be a Fascist or a Nazi without being a reactionary, without wanting to go back to a dictator, to the unlimited and absolute monarch, altho as yet they have not associated it with the hereditary principle. So far it is an advantage over absolute monarchy because the absolute monarch's son rarely proved capable of succeeding effectively to his absolute monarch-father.

Why are we faced by these reactions? Why are the pessimists so eagerly read and talked about, while carrying with them their saddening lesson to millions of thoughtful people thruout the world? Why? What is the matter?

My answer is that we have not yet learned the answer to the question, How to unify the world. This is the oldest question that has been before us from the days of ancient Greece. Plainly it cannot be done by the denial of the nation or by the reversal of the nation-building process; yet if the nation-building process goes on without limitation it must, as Spengler thinks, destroy itself and all of us in endless war.

What is the answer? The answer is the courage, the vision, and the wisdom to find a new and perhaps a final adaption of the great federal principle. We must federate these independent ethnic unities with their geographic unities in order that the world may be unified in a great, common unity without destroying the independence, the freedom, and the liberty of any of its members.

Can that be done? May I invite your attention to the early history of these United States? The world today is precisely where these United States were between the Battle of Yorktown in 1781 and the Ratification of the Federal Constitution in 1789. John Fiske calls that the critical period of American history, and we rightly call this the critical period in the world's history. Those eight years of the history of some 3,000,000 people in thirteen political units, far off on this distant shore, is the story of a laboratory experiment in the world-problem of today. It is putting, so to speak, under the microscope the happenings, the problems, the solutions, and showing how in the laboratory they can be carried to successful application with a view to teaching them to this present-day world.

People have no conception of how similar in every detail was the situation in these thirteen states to world conditions today. They were a prophecy of the present situation in the world at large. When you went from one state to another you paid 10 percent loss on your currency. If you left Massachusetts with a hundred dollars, it was ninety dollars in Connecticut, it was eighty dollars in New York, it was seventy dollars in New Jersey, it was sixty dollars in Pennsylvania. If you could afford it, it was fifty dollars in Maryland, forty dollars in Virginia, thirty dollars in North Carolina, twenty dollars in South Carolina, and ten dollars in Georgia. How does that contrast with the exchange conditions in the world today? They are absolutely the same. The amounts, the ratios are a little different, but the uncertainties, the problems, the lack of confidence, the inability to do business are all precisely the same as in these thirteen states before the Federal Constitution was ratified.

We are confronted with this question: Can the world learn? And we are confronted also by another question: Can the American people learn? Can they learn that in their hands is world-leadership, because they and they alone have had the needed experience? Ours is the only people which

has been thru these crises and which has had to deal with these problems.

There was a time not so long ago when we all had high hopes that these questions would be answered in the affirmative. Woodrow Wilson had a great vision, and had his temperament been equal to his vision great things would have been accomplished. Elihu Root, the outstanding American statesman of our time, came within an ace of being nominated for President at the Republican National Convention of 1916. Had he been so nominated, in my judgment he would have been elected, and the whole history of this world would have been different. He understood these problems. He had the capacity to interpret, to persuade, and to explain. He had vision, and it is my firm belief that these last ten terrible years would then have been avoided as the blot that they are and have been on the economic, the social, and the political history of the world.

One of the tragedies of our time, inexplicable tragedies, is that just as constructive steps were taking form two great statesmen, from countries historically opposed, who were in close and almost affectionate association, should both have passed from the world at an untimely age. It was the death of Stresemann of Germany and Briand of France that took from the men and women of our time the two great leaders who were in position to go forward. Neither Stresemann nor Briand has had any successor, and what has happened since their death by way of regression and retreat, we know only too well.

There is no more absurd notion than that held in this country that we should have nothing to do with Europe. It is our responsibility to the world and to ourselves to guide this world to a peaceful organization for the prosperity of all of us. You might just as well say that it is not the responsibility of any one to keep order in the city or in the state. This world has ceased to be made up of widely different, disparate, and disputing parts. The other day three Japanese left Tokyo at half-past five on Monday afternoon in an airplane. On

Wednesday morning they were in Calcutta, on Thursday morning they were in Bagdad, on Friday morning they were in Rome, and Friday afternoon, at half-past two, they were in London. Ten thousand miles, half-way round the world, between Monday afternoon and Friday afternoon, and yet we talk about isolation, about separation!

We have 24,000,000 automobiles in these United States, not one of them could have been built without the products of other parts of the world, and today we are starving our cotton growers and our farmers because we have not the intelligence to give them markets for their goods.

The question really is: How long is this to go on without constructive leadership? How long are we to drift. How long? The vision was given to us twenty-five years ago. How long are we to neglect it and turn our back upon it? How long are we to sit contentedly, because as yet nothing has happened on our doorstep, and let this Western civilization of which we have become the chief custodians go the way that Spengler and Ortega think it is going?

Our hundred and twenty million are now the largest single unit in the western world, the most effectively organized for leadership, with contacts of every kind and description. We have now drawn our population from thirty lands. We have built them together and intertwined them, with a geographic unity as our home which reaches from the Pine to the Palm, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, which has every kind of climate, every sort of soil, every variety of natural resource. How can we, with the great names of Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson and Lincoln, with what they left us to do, and after what we have already accomplished in this world, say that what Alexander the Great tried to do, what the Holy Roman Empire tried to do, is none of our business?

•

THE COMMUNITY OF INTEREST BETWEEN LABOR, CAPITAL AND AGRICULTURE¹

HENRY WALLACE

This address was delivered by the Secretary of Agriculture, before a Community Forum, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, at 8:00 P. M. Eastern standard time, on January 3, 1938. Its tone was "strikingly different" from the fiery speeches in which Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and Robert H. Jackson, Assistant Attorney-General, had recently assailed big business "abuses." It was less partisan in tone, for example, than Wallace's outstanding address at the Jackson Day dinner, Des Moines, on January 8, 1938.

There are many reasons why I am glad to come to Pittsburgh. In the first place, my grandfather Henry Wallace was born on a farm about 25 miles from here and in his autobiography tells many stories about this part of Pennsylvania. In the second place, Pittsburgh typifies more dramatically than almost any other city the close relationship which exists between farmers, industrial workers and capitalists. When the Pittsburgh steel mills are producing at only a fourth of their capacity, the price of hogs in the Corn Belt is several dollars a hundred lower than would otherwise be the case. This was driven into my consciousness in a most effective manner 18 years ago when I was working statistically with the nature of the demand for hogs. One of the conclusions reached was stated in a book which I wrote on "Agricultural Prices" as follows: "Prices of Connellsville coke are a better indicator of the demand for hogs than bank clearings." Of course, the economic analyses of supply and demand forces which I made in 1919 are very

¹ By permission of the author.

faulty indeed but I have never forgotten that of the various statistical measures of demand which I employed at that time, Connellsville coke prices were among the best. In other words, the prospect of unemployment in the Pittsburgh steel mills was of tremendous concern to Corn Belt farmers.

Again and again I have told farm audiences that only half of the farm problem is to be found on the farm. The other half is found in the towns and cities and in the nations overseas. There can be no genuine permanent farm prosperity as long as there is a serious unemployment problem in the cities.

I hope there are a number of leaders of labor in this audience because I think it is also important for labor to realize that only half the labor problem can be solved by the action taken by labor within the field of collective bargaining. The other half of the problem is to be found in agriculture, in capital and in the market overseas. Labor can never be permanently and genuinely prosperous until agriculture is getting a fair share in the national income. As long as farmers are getting a smaller share per capita than they got before the war, the jobs of labor will be imperiled, first, by the lack of purchasing power of farmers for city products and, second, by the extent to which farm boys and girls coming to town will be willing to work for less than organized labor in the cities.

The degree to which the labor problem is a farm problem and the farm problem a labor problem can be proved in many different ways. We know, for example, that ever since the World war the total factory payrolls have gone up and down year by year in complete sympathy with the total income of agriculture. In 1929 the total factory payrolls were close to twelve billion dollars and the gross income from agricultural production was close to twelve billion dollars. At the bottom of the depression in 1932 factory payrolls fell to about five billion dollars and the gross income of agriculture also fell to about five billion dollars. In the

year 1937, the gross income of agriculture will be about ten billion dollars and factory payrolls about ten billion dollars.

When the figures are analyzed on a month by month basis, we find it is possible for agriculture to get out of line with labor for several months at a time but the disparity can not long continue. In May, June and July of 1933, the income of agriculture increased much more rapidly than the income of factory workers. Then in the late summer and early fall of 1933 exactly the opposite took place. If one group gets very far out of line with the other, whatever the reason, the result within a few months is either that the other group pulls up into line or the group which is stepping too far out in front is pulled back. Labor and agriculture rise and fall together. It can never be otherwise. Unfortunately there are many people who try to stir up discord between farmers and laboring men. It is important for the future of our country that the real sources of this discord be reduced to the minimum and that agriculture and labor pull together for the enlightened prosperity of both.

It would be a fine thing if labor and agriculture could cooperate more continuously on their legislative program. Right now I would like to pay a tribute to the legislative representatives of labor in Congress for the splendid way in which they have supported agricultural legislation during the past 12 years. In 1927 and 1928 when the farm bills of that day were passed through Congress, the labor representatives took a very broad-gauged attitude and most of them voted with the representatives of the farmers of the South and of the Middle West. That has been true again and again in this administration. When the present agricultural legislation was being voted on by the House, there was one occasion in which the votes of the representatives of labor were all that stood between the bill and recommitment to the House Committee on Agriculture. Agriculture owes a debt of gratitude for the way in which the representatives of labor have stood by. I regret to say that a number of representatives of agriculture did not take quite as broad-gauged an

attitude with regard to the wages and hours bill when it was up for a vote in the final days of the special session. It seems to me important, therefore, that both labor and agriculture should understand each other much better than they have in the past and that an unusual effort should be made to work out agricultural and labor programs which will be to the best interests of both groups.

When the true mutuality of interest of both labor and agriculture is thought through, it will be discovered that the fundamental problem is one of both groups bringing about an increased balanced abundance. Neither group can stand for economics of scarcity, and neither group can stand for that type of abundance which produces waste. That type of agricultural abundance which produces 5 cent cotton, 20 cent corn and 30 cent wheat is definitely destructive to labor. In like manner, long hours and sweated wages are definitely destructive to agriculture.

The irritating difficulties so far as farmers are concerned are caused by those occasional situations in which they find themselves compelled to pay a very high price for services based on very short hours and a very high wage per hour. When labor falls under the control of racketeers, farmers oftentimes become very angry and question the right of big cities to exist. Probably not one industrial worker in a thousand has even an indirect connection with racketeering and yet the few instances which exist make it possible for those who try to stir up discord between labor and agriculture to deceive many thousands of farmers.

In like manner, these enemies of labor and agriculture attempt to deceive city audiences by telling them about the way in which farmers deliberately destroy food to get high prices. I suppose all of you in this audience have heard a thousand and one lies about the little pigs, the burning of grain, the slaughtering of sheep and cattle on the western range. I presume the majority of the city people of the United States actually believe that millions of acres of food crops have really been plowed up. Many of them actually

believe that the Department of Agriculture and the farmers have deliberately been trying to starve the people in the cities in order to bring about higher prices.

As a matter of fact, the farmers of the United States and the Department of Agriculture are supremely interested in producing an abundance of food for the people of this country. They want to produce this abundance year after year in such a way that their ability to continue to produce it is not undermined by the loss of soil fertility or by a destructively low income. When foreign markets disappear, farmers in cooperation with the government may find it necessary to take vigorous action. But farmers never have taken and in my opinion never will take action designed to bring about a shortage of food for the people of the United States. They are against the economics of scarcity; they are for the economics of balanced abundance. In fact they have had written into the 1936 agricultural act the requirement that total farm production be maintained to give city people at least normal volume of consumption. But in order for a balanced abundance in agriculture to be fully effective in terms of well-fed human beings in this country, it is vital that labor have the opportunity to be more productive in terms of annual per capita output. There are millions of people in the United States who eat only half as much dairy products, fruits and vegetables as they should. It will do no good whatever for the farmers to produce more dairy products, fruits and vegetables until such time as these people are put to work at productive jobs.

Farmers want to produce all the food city people can afford to buy. But if farmers throw more food on the market than city workers have the income to purchase, that not only drives down the price, but tends to wipe out altogether the value of the crop and the farmers' income. When that happens farmers can't buy what the city produces, industrial workers lose their jobs, and everybody is worse off. Balance in the production of farmer products means to keep production fully up to all that city workers can use and pay

for, without so glutting the markets as to bankrupt the farmers.

Better diets for the poor people of the cities cannot be obtained until they are provided real jobs producing abundantly the right kind of goods and earning enough income to buy the food they need. It is economic suicide for farmers to produce more milk, fruits and vegetables until this is done. The sentimentalist who self-righteously proclaims in a loud tone of voice that there can never be a surplus of food until the last hungry Oriental is fed, should turn his well-meaning heart to the problem of making it possible for city labor to turn out more of the right kind of goods and to earn enough to live decently.

There is no more reason why farmers should produce milk and vegetables for city people who are unable to buy than there is for automobile workers to produce automobiles for farmers living on farms so small and so poor that they are unable to buy. Both the poor farmer and the poor worker need increased opportunity for productivity. This problem in both agriculture and in labor can be solved only slowly and in the meantime, both agriculture and labor must stand for the objective of adjusting their production according to the principles of balanced abundance.

Any particular group in either labor or agriculture which obtains superior bargaining powers will do well to keep in mind the danger which will inevitably come if the bargaining advantages are pushed too far. There is a certain group in both labor and in agriculture which can easily make some of the same mistakes which have been made by some of the business groups.

If any group of city workers drives wages and prices too high in their industry, they are likely to cut off sales of their product and throw large numbers of their own workers into unemployment. Also, if they use their bargaining power to get extortionate wages, they are likely to throw their organization into disrepute. They don't want to do that; it doesn't pay either for them or the nation, in the long run.

What they want to do is to increase their productivity, and the productivity of other workers, steadily and progressively, and then use their bargaining power to get a fair share in this increasing output, so as to give them a steady but gradual rise in their standard of living.

Wage rates are not income. Workers are concerned with what they earn per week, month, and year. They must choose policies not merely to make rates per hour high, but to give them the best income per year. The same goes for farmers in dealing with prices or business men with respect to profit margins—too much profit or price per unit may oftentimes reduce the aggregate return for the year as a whole. It seems to me that all labor and agricultural organizations owe to their members the responsibility of asking how their various types of bargaining action will affect the increased balanced production of this nation. The only way we can have an increased standard of living in this country is to produce a continually expanding volume of goods, of the types people need and want, at prices low enough so they can be sold and used, but with such increasing income to farmers, city workers, and business men to maintain a steady expansion in our own market here at home for the goods we make.

The minds and hearts of all our farm and industrial workers must more and more become permeated with a genuine allegiance to some such principle of increased balanced abundance as I have just stated. In the year 1937 the total income of the United States was about \$68,000,000-000. What we should all be striving to bring to pass within the next three years is an income of at least \$90,000,000,000 without any material increase in prices except those prices which are notoriously out of line, such as cotton. Yes, we want an income of \$90,000,000,000 within three years based chiefly on increased production of goods rather than on a rise in prices. We want to see agriculture and labor both get their fair share of this increased national income but we want to see capital get enough increase out of this income so that

after all taxes are paid it will have the courage to do its part in bringing about increased production.

A common program for agriculture and labor is a thing to be welcomed rather than feared by capital. It is true that such a program will almost inevitably include an attack on predatory gains. We are not willing to pay toll past the castle of the baron on the hill. But business men in general are not seeking predatory privileges.

Business does want a chance to earn an honest return on true investment values. This it can hope to get in the long run only through balanced abundance. Business cannot hope for long to cover the overhead costs of its plant if it operates at 25 percent or 50 percent of capacity. It must recognize that profits are the reward of initiative and leadership and that ancient plants eventually become valueless. Any attempt over long periods of time to operate at limited capacity and to maintain the values of obsolete equipment will react against the interest of new investors, new capital and new business leadership. The true interests of capital, seeking opportunity for profitable investment, like the interests of agriculture and labor, lie in balanced abundance.

Again I want to urge that it is exceedingly important for workers and farmers not to strike out blindly at each other. It is important for labor leaders to realize that if labor should conduct an effective strike against the use of high priced farm products, the result would almost invariably be that many workers would begin to lose their jobs a few months later. On the whole, however, I believe that labor leaders have shown a greater understanding of and greater sympathy for the farm problem than farm leaders have shown for the labor problem.

It is somewhat difficult to convince farmers that high wages are good for them. So many farmers think that high wages mean lower priced farm products and higher priced city products. This farm fear is not well grounded if wages are raised gradually in normal times. A gradual improvement in wage rates in normal times is good for both farmers

and laboring men. Well paid labor is well fed labor, and well fed labor will turn out more per hour than poorly fed labor. Moreover, when there is a gradual improvement in wage rates there is a continual stimulation to inventions and ingenuity on the part of inventors and plant managers. I would like to point out some figures to those of you who think that higher wages are a menace to agriculture. Between 1923 and 1928, for instance, there was an increase of 7 percent in the wages and salaries of city workers. Was this 7 percent at the expense of agriculture? Does it show up in the margin between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays? We have the figures on this and find that the margin increased only 1 percent. Moreover, the income of the farmers increased 12 percent. Again, between the year 1934 and 1937 there was an increase in wages and salaries of 15 percent which resulted in a widening of the margin between what the farmers get and the consumers pay of 4 percent. At the same time the income of the farmers increased nearly 50 percent as the recovery programs put more city people back to work and enabled them to pay fairer retail prices for food. It seems to me that these two periods illustrate very clearly the falsity of the proposition which is so much urged by those who try to stir up trouble between farmers and working men.

Farm labor in all countries is notoriously underpaid and there is a tendency therefore for certain city groups to feel that farmers do not have a good attitude toward labor. In this connection, the all-important thing for city people to realize is that farm wages go up and down with farm income just as city wages go up and down with city income. When farm income is low, farm labor inevitably has a hard time. In 1932, for instance, farm income was one-third what it was in 1929 and farm labor received a wage which was 40 percent less than in 1929. Farm labor wages are also influenced to some extent by the situation of city labor. When city labor is forced by unemployment to seek work on farms, as many are now doing, farm wages tend to suffer and when

city wages have been going up faster than farm income there may be a few months when farmers will find it difficult to hire labor at a wage which they think is reasonable. Before labor leaders blame farmers for their attitude toward farm labor it is important for them to realize that farmers oftentimes find it utterly impossible to pay a living wage because they themselves are unable to get from the consuming public a living price for what they sell. If farm products were selling today on a basis to give both the farmer and farm labor a return per hour for their labor as much above the pre-war period as city labor is now getting, the price of the farm products of the United States today would be 70 percent above what it was in December of 1937. You can see therefore how hard it is for farmers to pay a living wage.

Our socially minded agricultural leaders are searching for ways to raise the standards of living in our rural areas. Farm labor as well as labor in industry is showing a greater dissatisfaction with low living standards and with the general lack of economic security. The farm laborers working on the small family size farms know that as long as the average farmer receives only half as many dollars as the average city person, it is impossible for farm labor to get a satisfactory wage. Farmers and farm laborers should strive together for a fair share in the national income for agriculture. Labor in the cities should sympathize with this effort because if it is not successful there will be a continual migration of farm labor to the cities. If this is fully understood it will be possible for farmers and workers to cooperate much better than would otherwise be the case. How far labor organization may be applicable to the problems of farm labor remains to be seen. Certainly we already know that the problems are so different as to call for different methods than are applicable to city labor. For example, the strike at harvest time is likely to mean completely lost opportunities to earn by both farmer and farm laborer. In many lines of industrial production a strike means merely deferred production until terms have been agreed upon.

It is important for the people in the towns and cities to realize how important the farmers are when it comes to sudden sharp reversals in trade trends. For example, there is strong evidence to indicate that in 1930 one-third of all the factory employees who lost their jobs did so because of the weakened farm situation. Again, it appears that in 1933 40 percent of all the employees who regained their jobs did so because of the strength in the farm situation and the consequent increased farm buying power for city products.

The branches of agriculture which labor leaders should study most closely are those which are affected by export trade, and especially wheat, cotton, lard, corn and tobacco. The income of farmers producing these crops fluctuates violently from year to year. When these products went down in 1930, 1931, and 1932 to one-half and then to less than one-third of what they had been in 1929, the destruction in farm buying power had a greater influence than any other one thing in bringing about the terrible unemployment situation in the cities. Until the production of these great export farm products becomes better adjusted to the changed foreign demand resulting from the great war there will be a continual threat to the employment of labor in the cities.

Those great export farm products seem to lead the way in agricultural trends in much the same way as steel seems to lead the way in industrial trends. When prices of wheat, corn, cotton and hogs go down, there is an almost immediate drop in the sale of automobiles and farm machinery. This is reflected at once in the activity of the steel mills. The trouble spreads at once from the unemployed in the cities to dairymen, vegetable growers and other farmers who are not affected directly by the export trade.

Because of the fact that export agriculture has been so seriously affected by world events since the great war, it has been one of the leading sources of economic instability. Leaders in dairying, in labor and in industry will never have a proper appreciation of the causes of instability in their own particular fields until they appreciate more fully the

instability which comes from export agriculture because of the foreign situation and because of weather.

Because the problem of export agriculture is so complex, many people would like to simplify it by the method of governmental price fixing. Many farmers and farm leaders have been talking in terms of fixing the price of cotton at 20 cents a pound, corn at \$1.00 a bushel, and wheat at \$1.20 a bushel. Some of them say this is the equivalent of what labor is getting because of the sanction by the government of collective bargaining. They say labor has used powers granted by the government to get wages twice as high as before the war. "Why shouldn't we have government powers which will enable us to get farm prices twice what they were before the war?" Such statements neglect entirely such important factors as changes in productivity. It is certainly to be hoped that workers in the great continuous strip steel mills built in the last few years will get more for a week's work than was earned in the old hand process. In like manner our 10 million farmers and farm workers feed a far larger population than the same number did in 1910. They too are entitled to increasing income from increasing efficiency. But even if the argument of price fixing were accepted as reasonable, I know that when the government assumes definite responsibility for high prices of farm products it will be necessary to license every man who purchases farm products as well as every farmer who sells farm products. For example, if the government fixed the price of cotton at 20 cents a pound it would be necessary to license every purchaser of cotton to see that he didn't pay less than 20 cents a pound. Furthermore, it would be necessary to issue permits to every cotton producer as to how many pounds of cotton he could sell at 20 cents a pound, because he could sell only a part of his crop at such a high price.

No, I do not like drastic action of this sort. It is far better I believe for farm income to be increased more slowly by the methods which we have been using in recent years. The combination of the soil conservation program and devices

aimed at a more stable supply of farm products such as the ever-normal granary will bring about a gradual increase in farm income and at the same time protect the consumer. I hope a similar program can be perfected for labor which will make it possible to increase wages of labor in line with an equal increase in the productivity of labor. According to past records a 2 to 3 percent increase in wages and productivity per year would mean greater stability and a doubling of our real income per worker every 20 years. Some sections of city labor are well paid already. Other groups are miserably paid, and their pay should be increased more rapidly until they have at least a minimum standard. The legislation which was turned down by the House in the closing days of the last session would have been helpful in this direction, and I am sorry that the representatives of the farm people did not support this legislation more vigorously.

I wish there were continual conferences between the leaders of labor and agriculture to consider the ways and means of bringing about a progressive balance between the two. In both labor and agriculture there has been an extraordinary technological improvement in recent years. We have new types of farm machinery, new methods of fertilizing the soil, new varieties of crops, new methods of feeding animals. In industry the modern factories are oftentimes 50 percent more efficient than the old factories and in some cases they require less than half as much labor. The problem is to convert this tremendously increased efficiency, both in agriculture and in industry, into terms of human service. What good is a technology which creates unemployment and ruins farmers? There is no benefit to labor if labor increases its share in the national income for six months and agriculture lags behind, and the unbalance results in a smash. The supreme problem for both agriculture and labor leaders is to bring about a balance between labor and agriculture so that there can be a steady increase in the production of needed goods of at least two or three percent a year. There must also be a steady increase in the diffusion of the results of

technology so that more people benefit. These objectives can be accomplished only slowly. Dairy and vegetable farmers can slowly increase their output as the poorer people in the towns and cities are enabled to do useful work and therefore to get the money which they need to buy the vitally necessary milk and leafy vegetables. I was glad to see the Agricultural Committee of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce recognize so clearly this all-important fact in the report it made public last week.

It is so exceedingly important to farmers that the people in the cities set their house in order. At the present time one-half of our farmers are producing 90 percent of the food which moves into the towns and cities. Millions of people living on the land have absolutely no opportunity for profitable employment there. They are living on small, poor farms and they and their children can not do anything but lead a miserable existence until such time as the wheels of industry are set going in the cities and it becomes possible for many of them to return to the cities from which they came in the first place. Unfortunately, many of these are ignorant and in some cases their attitude is bad because of the setback which they received in the early '30's. In the vast majority of cases the children of these people are fine human material and will turn out all right provided they have the necessary food, clothing, shelter and education. But if the children continue to live where their parents are now living the result in many cases will be wasted lives simply because it is impossible for anyone to make a satisfactory living or to bring up children properly with such poor land and such small farms.

A balanced continuing expansion of production of goods is dependent in a large measure on the sympathetic understanding existing between labor and agriculture. This economic outcome is important but it is almost equally important that the farmers and laborers understand each other better politically. The farmers of the South, the farmers of the Middle West, the workers of the East and the small business

and professional men of the towns and cities, can, if they understand each other, furnish the very backbone of the progressive democracy of the future and can furnish the opportunity for all other progressive people, wherever they are, to join them. In Andrew Jackson's day this was the coalition which had power in this country—southern farmers, Western farmers and Eastern workers.

Unfortunately in Andrew Jackson's day they did not sufficiently take into account the importance of capital. Whenever farmers and laborers working together politically do not understand the relationship of capital to the general welfare, there is trouble ahead.

It is my belief that business management and investors both have everything to gain from a sound working relationship between agriculture and labor. If business management is willing to produce and sell at prices which with full production will return a reasonable yield on the capital invested, and if investors are willing to put their funds into use at moderate interest rates, they will find wide markets for their products and effective use for their funds. The more effectively farmers and labor cooperate to expand production, the wider will be the opportunities for industry as a whole. Yes, there will be plenty of work for all capital which is willing to accept a fair return as soon as labor, capital and agriculture really understand each other and start pulling together to turn out more goods in such a balanced way that there will be no serious set-backs.

Farmers, workers, and business men all suffer when investment varies widely from time to time, and when steel and other durable goods industries fluctuate erratically between frantic attempts to fill orders at one time and almost complete stagnation at others. When new investment, or even the expenditure of depreciation reserves for repairs and replacements, is checked by business uncertainty or fright, or by investors' fears, business activity, industrial payrolls, and the demand for farm products collapse together. It doesn't do either labor or agriculture any good to scare capital;

instead, they must all find ways to work together. Means must be worked out so that repairs and depreciation can be made good, and new plants created, more evenly year after year, instead of all in a lump when times seem good. Co-operation between farmers and workers is needed for expanding production, and cooperation of both with business men and investors is needed to create a steady flow in the creation of durable goods. If this problem can be solved, much of the extreme ups and downs of the business cycle may be smoothed out.

What we want is a long, steady pull upward. Most people know that the business expansion last spring was not healthy. It was too much based on the bonus expenditures of 1936, on other government expenditures which were rapidly being tapered off, on an irregular foreign demand for war materials, on a rush of business men to build up inventories to protect against anticipated price advances, and on building costs which were too far out of line with the capacity of people to pay. Too many people were buying because they thought inflation was just around the corner. There was little concept of a long-steady pull for permanent prosperity. This recession is giving all of us, labor, capital, agriculture and government alike, a much needed lesson.

Looking toward the future I hope the day will come when there will be greater unity and more practical cooperation among the farm groups, the labor groups and the groups representing industry and finance. It is unfortunate that farm groups should fight each other, that labor groups should fight each other and that business groups should cut each other's throats. Healthy competition is one thing—destructive warfare is another.

Capitalists often fight each other and farmers, workers and government are often critical of a few capitalists for very good reasons. But in all such fighting and in all such criticisms it is important to remember that capital itself is different from a few short sighted capitalists. We may benefit the general welfare by attacking the abuses of certain

capitalists. But in all such attacks both farmers and workers must keep in mind the absolutely vital function of capital. If it doesn't come from private investors it must come from government. If it comes from government it must come either from taxation or from budget deficits. Obviously the chief reliance must be on private investors with governmental capital available in case of need to reduce unemployment and to prime the productivity pump insofar as possible without producing inflation. As we consider the absolutely vital functions of capital we should all remember that there are a number of capitalists who are capable of lifting their eyes higher than the problem of profit to the general welfare considerations involved in getting new industries started in a sensible way. Capitalists with vision should not be blamed for the abuses practiced by the others. Of course there are certain abuses which are inherent in any system of maturing capitalism with which we must wrestle courageously in order to keep capitalism from destroying itself. Insofar as we have set our hand to that task, I hope the utmost of good feeling will characterize all our efforts and that the flow of private capital into productive investment will be encouraged. The time is now rapidly approaching when the general public will demand that labor, capital and agriculture spend less of their energy in a struggle for relative advantage and more of their energy in devising constructive cooperative ways to increase the national output. We have the inventive ability, the factories, the workers, the farmers, to take care of all of our people in marvelous fashion. Capital, labor, and agriculture cooperating can do the job. On behalf of the general welfare, these three great economic forces must learn to fight together and not against each other. Government is willing to help. The recession presents the challenge. Are we sufficiently men of good will to accept that challenge?

•

THE INSIDE STORY OF A RACKET¹

THOMAS E. DEWEY

This speech was delivered over WJZ, Sunday, October 24, 1937, at 6:30 P. M. It was fourth in a series of five radio addresses on "The Inside Story of a Racket," which Thomas E. Dewey, the special prosecutor for New York County, delivered in support of his candidacy for the district attorneyship of New York County. The speech was an attack upon Albert Marinelli, Tammany leader of half of the second assembly district. Dewey, candidate of the Republican, American Labor, City Fusion and Progressive parties, with F. H. LaGuardia as their choice for Mayor, was opposed by the Tammany candidate, Harold W. Hastings. In the election of November 3, 1937, Dewey defeated Hastings by a majority of more than 300,000 and thus removed Tammany from the office it had had for twenty years.

The speech may be classified as both forensic (even though not delivered in a court room) and demonstrative (in this case a campaign address).

Tonight I am going to talk about the alliance between crime and politics in the County of New York.

I am going to tell you about a politician, a political ally of thieves, pickpockets, thugs, dope peddlers and big-shot racketeers. Albert Marinelli, County Clerk of New York, powerful leader of half the second assembly district, dominates the whole. He attained power by staying in the dark and keeping his mouth shut. Tonight we turn on the spotlight.

The people in the second assembly district in downtown New York know what gorillas they have met at the polls, how they have been threatened, how their votes have been stolen; and I am going to tell them how it came about that gangsters roamed their neighborhood immune from prosecution.

¹ By permission of the author and of the Thomas E. Dewey Citizenship Committee.

For years racketeers used the name of Marinelli to frighten victims—and not in vain. Back in 1932 there was a pair of rising gangsters known as James Plumeri alias Jimmy Doyle and Dominick Didato alias Dick Terry. They had never driven a truck but they were handy with a knife or a gun. They decided to take over the downtown trucking industry. They started by forming a so-called truckmens' association at 225 Lafayette Street, which just happened to be the building where Marinelli had his office and his Albert Marinelli Association. They elected themselves President and Treasurer of this Five Borough Truckmen's Association, and were ready for the business of intimidating truckmen. For front men, and to help with the rough work they took on Natale Evola and John Dio. They went to work on the truckmen. They set themselves up as dictators. They told decent truckmen whom they could truck for and whom they could not. They enforced their rules by beatings, stench-bombs and the destruction of trucks. They boasted of their political connections.

William Brown was a typical victim. Together with his wife he ran a small trucking business on West Twenty-first Street. The Browns had three trucks. They were struggling along in 1933, making a fair go of it, until the racket got after them. As a result of their troubles, his wife had a nervous breakdown. Brown's brother was beaten black and blue, and their best truck was wrecked.

Brown and his wife were sitting in their trucking office one night working on the books. Terry and Doyle walked in. Brown had just got a new customer.

"What's the idea of your taking this account?" Doyle demanded. "We are from the Five Borough Truckmen's Association. You can't get away with taking any of these accounts around here."

Now, Brown had courage. He told them where to get off. Doyle threatened, "You know what happens to guys that don't play ball with us. They are pretty soon out of business."

Then they shoved Brown up against the wall and told him that unless he gave up that account they would put emery in his truck motors and beat up his drivers. Then Doyle said, "We've had a lot of complaints against us in the last year and we've beat every rap. All we got to do is call up Al Marinelli and the rap is killed. He's the man we got higher up that's protecting us."

Brown defied the gangsters, and within three weeks there was emery powder in the crankcase of his best truck. It wrecked the motor. Seven gorillas entered the office one night, threw monkey wrenches at Brown's brother and beat him with an ax handle. He was in bed for two weeks. A fellow worker was slugged at the same time.

Mr. and Mrs. Brown were terrified. They remembered what Doyle had said about protection from Marinelli. They were afraid to go to the District Attorney's office and so they kept quiet. Then one night in May, 1933, Brown was listening to the radio and he heard a speech by the man who was then the Police Commissioner who said racket victims should come in and he would see they were protected. The very next morning Brown was at the Police Commissioner's office, and he was sent at once to tell his story to the grand jury. Indictments for coercion and conspiracy were voted against Dick Terry, Jimmy Doyle, and Johnny Dio. Brown and his wife went home believing they had found justice.

But the case dragged on for a year with no trial. Finally Brown got a subpoena calling him to the Court of General Sessions for the trial. He handed his subpoena to the clerk and the clerk said, "Why that's a wrong date on that subpoena; your case was dismissed yesterday." And the record shows the dismissal on recommendation of the district attorney.

Last week the district attorney of New York County tried to explain away one of the turnouts his office gave this gang. This is what he said—and I am quoting him—"The defendant Didato died, I understand, in August 1933." Let me inform the district attorney, Didato was murdered by gunmen in the

office of the Five-Boro Truckmen's Association in the building where Al Marinelli's Association is, six blocks from the district attorney's office. It was a double shooting. When the smoke had cleared away, Didato, alias Terry, lay dying on the floor and Doyle was seriously wounded. But Doyle lived to go on with the racket, a racket immune from prosecution.

The ignorance of the district attorney of murders and racketeering in his own county is not confined to the trucking racket as we have shown before. But here's another example in that particular racket.

Less than a year before the turnout on the Brown complaint, a truckman named Blackoff had caused the arrest of Terry, Dio and Evola for threatening him with violence if he did not obey the mob. At the time of the arrest of these defendants police found right in their car a bottle full of emery. Emery is the same to a truck racketeer as a jimmy is to a burglar. It is the instrument of crime, poured into the crankcase to grind the motor to pieces. This case came to trial in 1932. The emery was right there in the court room. Twice the Court asked the prosecutor what significance the emery had. And the stenographic record of the trial shows that the assistant district attorney failed to advise the Court. The instrument of crime was there and the prosecutor stood silent. The best information the Court could get the prosecutor to disclose was that emery was used for grinding valves. So the case ended with an acquittal and the racket went marching on.

The murder of Dick Terry was just an incident in the growth of the racket. With him out of the way, Johnny Dio and Jimmy Doyle moved uptown. With the Brown indictment still open and hanging fire in the district attorney's office, they brazenly served notice on the Garment Center Truck Owners Association. They said, "We are taking over your association. If you don't pay, we are coming uptown and there will be busted trucks and broken heads". The president of the Association consulted his directors. They were worried. Somebody suggested that they go to the dis-

trict attorney of New York County. But everybody agreed that would be too dangerous. Nothing but turnouts had resulted from complaints to the district attorney. So the directors agreed that the only thing the association could do was pay up and shut up. And they did.

All of these charges, fumbled by the district attorney, together with others, were brought to trial in the spring of this year by my office. After a year of investigation we procured an indictment exposing the entire brazen history of the trucking racket. Finally Jimmy Doyle and Johnny Dio pleaded guilty on every count, after my assistants, Murray I. Gurfein and Jacob Grumet, had presented the people's evidence. The men the district attorney turned loose are now in state's prison.

Before that case came to trial, Evola was sought as a material witness by my office. The police went looking for Evola. But he couldn't be found. We did find that after his acquittal Evola had become a member of the County Committee in Al Marinelli's district, and while a member of that Committee, he became a fugitive and never was found. Perhaps that is why he was not designated as County Committeeman again this year.

Who is this Albert Marinelli? Officially he is your county clerk. You elected him four years ago. He survived the LaGuardia landslide because the people did not take the trouble to know who was running for county clerk, just as the machine controlled district attorney survived, with the help of Marinelli and his boys.

It was Marinelli's office which affixed his signature to the extradition papers for his friend, Lucky Luciano, which my office used to bring that worthy back from Hot Springs, Arkansas.

Al Marinelli today is one of the most powerful politicians in New York. This shadowy figure gives no interviews to the press. His history is shrouded in mystery. No one even knows just how he rose to power. In 1931 he took over the leadership of the second assembly district of Manhattan. Rapidly his power spread to other districts. In 1935

he put up a handpicked candidate named Joseph Greenfield and unseated David Mahoney as leader of half of the first assembly district. Mahoney charged that two notorious racketeers, Socks Lanza and John Torrio, were active in that election which led to Marinelli's triumph. Lanza was the gorilla who dominated the Fulton Fish Market for years. Complaints were made to the district attorney of New York County against Lanza but they were ignored. Lanza was the cause of one of those frequent scandals in the machine dominated district attorney's office which resulted in an investigation ordered by Governor Roosevelt. It took the Federal Government to catch up with Lanza and save the fish industry from his terrorism. Torrio, once the boss of Al Capone in Chicago, is now under indictment in Federal Court. When he was brought to Court, he put up \$100,000 in cash for bail. Somehow or other, Torrio was also indicted on a forgery charge last year by the district attorney of New York County, but the indictment was quietly dismissed last December and Torrio walked out a free man.

Mysterious as he may be in New York, Marinelli's supporters may be interested to know that he has a luxurious estate surrounded by an iron fence, on Lake Ronkonkoma, way out on Long Island. From his several motor cars, he chooses to drive back and forth in a Lincoln limousine; and his Japanese butler, Togo, serves him well.

Regularly, you will find Al standing in the basement of the Criminal Courts Building in Manhattan, quietly chatting with bondsmen, lawyers, and hangers-on. Your county clerk has many, diversified interests.

In 1932, when Marinelli set out to attend a function in Chicago, there was with him a well-dressed, pasty-faced, sinister man with a drooping right eye. He had an air of quiet authority. Together, they turned up in Chicago, playing host in a suite at the Drake Hotel, and were constant companions at the race track in the afternoons. Marinelli's companion was Charlie Lucky Luciano, then almost as unknown as Marinelli, later revealed as the Number One man of New

York's underworld, master of many rackets. Luciano is now in Dannemora Prison, serving a sentence of thirty to fifty years.

In January, 1935, the Marinelli Beefsteak Dinner was a colorful affair. Benny Spiller, loan shark for the Luciano mob, bought tickets and was there. So did Jesse Jacobs, the Luck mob bondsman. So had the bookers and other hangers-on in the prostitution racket. They knew they had better buy, for Davie Betillo was selling tickets,—the same "Little Davie" who was a Capone trigger-man for five years, and later Lucky Luciano's chief henchman in New York. All of these boys are now in jail at last, as a result of the prosecution we completed last year.

Some of the facts about Al Marinelli and his organization are matters of record and you are entitled to know the kind of man who helps to pick your public officials—who helps select those who are in charge of criminal justice.

Back in 1933 while I was a chief assistant United States attorney, the United States Government conducted an investigation of election frauds under the Federal law. Election inspectors in various districts of the city were indicted and convicted but nowhere were conditions worse than in Al Marinelli's second assembly district. In that district alone, the records indicate, they had added 4,534 votes to their own set of candidates and stolen 3,535 from the others. You know, in some districts the dominant party will bribe or intimidate the officials appointed by the other party. And both become parties to the corruption of the ballot. Democrats and Republicans alike were indicted.

Let us take just two election districts in Marinelli's district. We'll see who was running the election for Al. In the 28th election district, the chairman of the election board was George Cingola. He was the man directly charged with preserving the peace at the polls and seeing that there was an honest count. He was imported into the district for the election and registered from the home of his sister. Back in 1927 he had once before been arrested for an election offense

and "beat the rap". But less than a year before he was appointed to his 1932 election day job, he was arrested no less than three times—twice for assault and once for bootlegging and he served a term for one of the assault raps in the county jail in Mineola. And just a few months before that, three detectives of the Police Department Narcotic Squad, upon arresting him in his home found him sleeping with two loaded revolvers under his pillow. He was convicted in the Court of Special Sessions for his double violation of the Sullivan Law. He was let off with a \$25 fine. And so he became qualified to serve as an election inspector. Marinelli made him the public official in charge of the polling place and graced him with the title of chairman of the local board of elections.

He was indicted by the Federal Attorney's office, but he has not been heard from since, and the indictment has now been dismissed.

Another expert election official in that assembly district that year was Charles Falci. He, too, was brought in specially for the occasion from Brooklyn. Marinelli made him an election inspector in the 23rd election district. Falci was indicted, but he also ran away.

For years Falci was a fugitive from justice. Last year, Falci was caught and the fact is that during the time he was a fugitive from justice he had been Al Marinelli's private chauffeur. He had been driving Marinelli's Lincoln limousine. He had been working around Al Marinelli's estate at Lake Ronkonkoma, sharing the work with Togo, the Japanese butler. On Christmas Eve of 1935 Marinelli had made a touching gift to his faithful servant of a chauffeur's livery and a pair of shoes, bought at Wanamaker's for \$38.50.

The members of Al Marinelli's county committee faithfully elect him year after year and faithfully work for his candidates. They ratify the party choices and work desperately for them, this year most of all. You are entitled to know what kind of people some of them have been.

I have the official criminal records in front of me. Here is the first one. He has eight arrests to his credit, but the only charge which stuck was one in the Federal Court for selling dope. They sent him to prison for that one but on the other seven arrests, going way back to 1918 when he was locked up for robbery, he has "beaten the rap." These include two charges of robbery and one each of felonious assault, disorderly conduct, malicious mischief and grand larceny.

Here is another who has a great personal interest in law enforcement and municipal government in New York. He began in 1924 with a sentence to Atlanta for counterfeiting. Some years later he was picked up for extortion and carrying a gun, but it took him only two weeks to get out. Only a month later, he was again in the hands of the police, charged with homicide with a gun. But he "beat that rap" too. Last month he was named as a member of Al Marinelli's County Committee.

Here's one who started his criminal career with an arrest in Hoboken, New Jersey, as a horse thief. He got out of that rap and also a later one for felonious assault. A year later, the law finally caught up with him and he was convicted on an assault charge. For fifteen years then he kept his name off the police books, but in 1929 he was again arrested for assault and robbery. He "beat that rap," but fourteen months later he was caught peddling drugs and finally went to the penitentiary again. Known to the police as a public enemy, he was arrested in 1935, but was discharged. He joined Al Marinelli's County Committee that year and was handed another term last month.

Here's one who qualified back in 1928 by getting himself convicted for dope peddling and in due course graduated from a term in Atlanta Penitentiary. Last month he qualified as a County Committeeman for Al Marinelli.

Dope peddling is also the habit of another. He began by beating a homicide charge in 1923, and after that, arrests for robbery and manslaughter were turned out, but a narcotic charge did stick and this statesman of the second assembly

district was fined \$25. Later he was arrested, charged with the possession of a large quantity of opium, but a turnout resulted.

Here's another, with a record of two convictions, first for impersonating a police officer, and then for drugs.

Listen to this one. He started thirty years ago with a discharge on a pickpocket charge; five years were spent in a New Jersey prison for assault and robbery; he was dismissed on a charge of homicide with a knife in 1927.

Now here's one party who was never caught as a peddler of dope. He is just an ordinary ex-convict, with an assault conviction.

Here's some more. But these men are probably not particularly important in the councils of the second assembly district. They've never been convicted of crime. But perhaps I'm wrong—it may be that their achievement in avoiding conviction entitles them to special honor in the Marinelli councils.

One of these was just selected County Committeeman last month. He has to his credit discharges on complaints of stealing an automobile, robbery with a gun, and vagrancy. Another of his fellows who was just chosen has a vagrancy discharge. A colleague of his, likewise selected last month, beat an attempted robbery charge. Another of his fellows was turned out on a grand larceny charge. Here is a precious pair who each beat two "raps." The first one on a felony assault charge and for stealing an automobile; another for toting a gun and for coercion. Here's another charged with being a fence for receiving stolen goods. Then we have one who ran up against the liquor law a couple of times and another who was in conflict with a policy charge. All of these, as members of the official county committee of the second assembly district! Aside from those who always "beat the rap," the ex-convicts alone include a counterfeiter, a stickup man, and others convicted of assault, injuring property, gun toting, impersonation of a public officer and larceny, both grand and petty. Worst of all are the six convicted of dope charges.

What an intense interest these men must have in electing the public officials who administer criminal justice! What an interest these men must have in decent municipal government! But that is not all. These criminal records on more than a score of Al Marinelli's county committeemen tell only part of the story. There are also the election inspectors.

Inspectors of election are public officials, certified to by the county chairman from a list provided by the leader. Let's look at Al Marinelli's election officials. Perhaps we will find out the reason for some of the things that have been going on in New York. Here are some of the men officially designated to keep the peace, certify to the honesty of the election and count the votes in the second assembly district. This faithful worker who counts your votes started as a pickpocket in 1908. He wasn't out long before he was convicted of grand larceny, and later of assault. But he won't serve as an election inspector this year. On June 1st he ran up against the Federal Government and a United States judge sent him to Lewisberg Penitentiary for a year and a half.

Here is another who counted your votes last year. His police record doesn't indicate whether he is in jail at this moment so I can't tell whether he will be an inspector this year. Starting with a conviction for grand larceny in 1922, he was arrested and convicted for petty larceny a year later. He was caught again two years later and again convicted on petty larceny but got a suspended sentence and went back to jail as a parole violator. He wasn't out long on that one before he was arrested and "beat the rap" for burglary. In 1930 he was arrested, charged with possessing counterfeit money, and turned over to the Federal Government.

Here are three more vote counters. The first has three arrests to his credit but went to jail only once. That was for petty larceny. Three years ago he was arrested for felonious assault but it took him only a day to get out.

Another was convicted of attempted grand larceny in New Jersey and still another, whose pedigree I have here was

convicted on a policy charge. But he acted as an election inspector last year and you will probably see him at it this year too.

Of course some of the election inspectors in the second always manage to "beat the rap." Here is one who wiggled out of two burglary charges. Another was acquitted of burglary and a third was discharged on a grand larceny count.

Well, these are some of the county committeemen and inspectors of election in the 2nd assembly district. I have police records for thirty-two of them. Twenty of this fine assortment, who have been selected to serve on the county committee or to count votes, have been convicted at least once. The other dozen have thus far succeeded in "beating the rap." Their attainments include seventy-six arrests on a varied assortment of charges ranging from robbery to sex crimes, with dope peddlers heading the list. No wonder they are desperately fighting to keep the office of the district attorney in the same hands it has been for twenty years. No wonder Marinelli is joining with his pals, running the fight of his life.

The people of the second assembly district are entitled to know the facts about those who have been misrepresenting them in the political councils of New York. For years they have been terrorized at the polls and forced to submit throughout the year to the domination of the gunmen who paraded their streets. And don't for one moment believe these are the only cases.

On Wednesday night at 10:30, over WABC you will learn more about what we are fighting in this campaign. You will learn more of the reasons why the office of district attorney is the most cherished prize of the political leaders who want to continue their control of criminal justice.

These are the sinister forces who are fighting to keep the right to select assistants for the office of district attorney of New York County. These are the living obstacles to everything that's decent and clean in the conduct of our city.

This is not a political issue. There can be no difference of opinion on the questions involved. Gorillas, thieves, pick-pockets, and dope peddlers in the political structure are not the subject of argument. There is nothing political about human decency.

The issue is defined. The decision is in your hands on election day.

THE JUDICIARY¹

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, delivered this address before the American Law Institute at Washington, D. C. on May 12, 1938. It was the first address by the Chief Justice since President Roosevelt had named Justices Hugo L. Black and Stanley F. Reed to the Supreme Court. The speech followed by seventeen days the Kansas City Stock Yards decision by the Supreme Court, a decision which seemingly rebuked Henry Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, for not giving livestock commission men a full and fair hearing. The speech was construed by part of the press as an indirect criticism of Hugo Black whose fitness for his high judicial had been attacked at the time of his appointment. Nothing in Justice Hughes' address, however, may be fairly interpreted as a criticism of any of his colleagues in the highest court.

When, under the Presidency of Mr. Taft, it was suggested that the Supreme Court should have a separate building, Chief Justice White strongly objected. Among other grounds, he feared that the removal of the Court from the Capitol might cause a loss of public interest. The Court would be isolated and might largely be ignored. So far as I can judge from the course of events, that fear has not been realized. Nor do we lack visitors. Our records show that over 88,000 visited the Supreme Court Building during the month of April, and in one day the number was nearly 7,000.

I am fond of recalling that Prof. Hiram Corson, of Cornell University, a distinguished scholar of his day, on returning to Ithaca from a visit to New York where he had witnessed a lavish production of a play of Shakespeare, confessed to some disappointment. "Why," he said, "when the curtain rose, the audience applauded the scenery." I imagine

¹ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 83. No. 98. p. 8991-92. May 13, 1938 By permission of the author.

that the audience was really interested in the setting because of their interest in the drama.

The work of the Court continues in volume and importance. When we began the present recess, on May 2, our statistics showed that we had disposed during the present term of 878 cases as against 820 in the corresponding period of last term. The number of cases on our dockets had increased this term by 65. We expect to adjourn at the end of this month with all cases disposed of which were ready for hearing.

The past year has witnessed the retirement of two of our most eminent judges, Willis Van Devanter and George Sutherland. I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without a tribute to their service. Justice Van Devanter began his judicial career about 49 years ago as chief of the Supreme Court of Wyoming. His service on the Federal bench began in 1903 as circuit judge in the eighth circuit, and in 1911 he came to the Supreme Court. It is unnecessary to remind this body of judges and lawyers of the vast importance of the work of the Court which, unspectacular and hence largely unnoticed by the press and the public, goes on from day to day, demanding unremitting industry and technical competence. The public are naturally interested in the great divisive cases in constitutional law, but these are few and constitute but a small part of the burden which the court constantly bears. In the discharge of its work, the conference of the Court is of the greatest importance, as there the Court discusses and decides the cases which have been heard and passes upon the applications for permission to be heard. It was in that conference that Justice Van Devanter's wide experience, his precise knowledge, his accurate memory, and his capacity for clear elucidation of precedent and principle contributed in a remarkable degree to the disposition of the Court's business. And, aside from his broad knowledge of the law, he had enjoyed the opportunities for special training in public-land law, which made his participation in that class of cases of peculiar value. Few judges in our

history have rivaled him in fitness by reason of learning, skill, and temperament for the judicial office.

Justice Sutherland came to the Court after a notable public career as a Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. Like Justice Van Devanter, he had his training in the West, and he was familiar with all the peculiar problems of the new states formed from our great western acquisitions. He had a special aptitude for the law, and his powers of analysis and exposition, his industry and thoroughness, have made his judicial opinions a highly important part of the jurisprudence of the Court. He has been the embodiment of judicial integrity—conscientious and independent. Bearing his full share of the work of the Court, unflagging in his labors, he never failed in courtesy, and his keen sense of humor and his rare ability as a raconteur made his companionship one of the special privileges of the intimate association of the members of the Court. We honor these judges in their retirement, and we cherish the memory of their fidelity to the best traditions of the bench.

I question if there is any greater need at this time than continued respect for the judicial tradition of independence and impartiality. It is in the judicial process that we find the most developed and systematic effort of a democratic community to maintain the interests of justice by opposing reason to passion, accepted principles to unbridled discretion, and the requirements of fair play to the favoritism or tyranny of power. The defects in judicial administrations, which have made the public critical and restive, and which sometimes have obscured in public estimation the service of the courts, have been due in part to the law and in part to lawyers and judges. The law has lacked clarity, has maintained an unnecessarily complex procedure, and has permitted obstacles to be interposed to the prompt disposition of controversies. Too many lawyers have made the practice of their art a display of skill in avoiding or delaying the determination of cases on their merits by resort to technical

obstructions. And, here and there, we find a judge who by pettiness, petulance, arbitrary conduct or procrastination in rendering decisions, has brought his office into disrepute. Despite all the just complaints addressed to these shortcomings, the judicial tradition still stands forth in testimony to the endeavor of the people to be just and to maintain their rights against the varied opportunities for partiality and oppression in administration.

You have been busy for years in the undertaking to reduce the complexities of the law, to give it, so far as possible, needed clarity and simplicity, and the value of your efforts is receiving increasing recognition as the courts use and cite the restatements issued by this institute. Judicial councils in a number of States are watching and appraising the work of the courts. In the Federal sphere, the Supreme Court, some time ago, under the act of Congress of 1933, formulated rules which have expedited proceedings on appeals in criminal cases. Recently the Supreme Court submitted to the Congress, under the act of 1934, a body of rules of civil procedure so as to provide one form of civil action and procedure for both cases in equity and actions at law. To make this possible the Supreme Court enlisted the services of a distinguished body of practicing lawyers and professors of law who had specialized in the study of procedure. Their proposals were submitted to the consideration of the bench and bar of the country and have been widely discussed and approved. The Supreme Court examined these proposals and with certain changes adopted them. Under the statute they are to go into effect after the close of the present session unless Congress shall provide otherwise. Thus in the recent years we have witnessed a series of outstanding efforts to remedy the defects in the law, so far as these are responsible for unnecessary obstacles to obtaining as speedy justice as is consistent with a fair and full hearing.

With respect to the Federal courts also, the judicial conference of senior circuit judges annually considers the state of the work in the various districts and circuits and

recommends such additional judges as seem to be required. The progress in the prompt disposition of cases is noteworthy and most gratifying. The last report of the judicial conference shows a greater number of districts in which the trial dockets are said to be current; that is, where all cases in which issue has been joined and which are ready for trial are disposed of not later than the term following the joinder of issue, except cases continued at the request of counsel. It appears that in the fiscal year 1934 there were only 31 districts of which that could be said; in 1935, 46 districts; in 1936, 51 districts; while in 1937 the Attorney General's report showed that the work of the district courts was thus current in 68 of the 84 districts, exclusive of the District of Columbia. That report also showed that the same condition prevailed in some divisions of four other districts and as to certain types of business in five other districts. In some districts equity cases may be tried even between terms if ready. The survey made by the judicial conference clearly indicated that the question of delays in the trial of cases after joinder of issue was one that should be considered with respect to particular districts and afforded no just ground for general criticism of the work of the district courts. Recommendations for additional judges to make possible the more prompt disposition of work in congested districts are now pending in Congress. The judicial conference is an institution of great promise, whose supervisory functions could wisely be extended.

Still the prime necessity of making the judicial machinery work to the best advantage is the able and industrious judge, qualified by training, experience, and temperament for his office. He can accomplish much with a poor procedural system and the improvement in rules procedure vastly increases his opportunity. We are fortunate in the great number of such judges that we have throughout the country, and only the ill-informed or ill-disposed would overlook that fact. It is the exceptions among the judges, who with their conspicuous ineptness, do the harm, and they need such admoni-

tion as it may be practicable to give under our system. But the maintenance of the standards of judicial office rest chiefly with the electorate, where judges are elected, and with the appointing power, where they are appointed, and in both relations a vigilant bar through its organized effort to secure good judges should exercise, and constantly seek to exercise, a potent influence. The bar in each community well know who are fitted by ability and character for the work of the courts.

There is another relation in which the judicial tradition has, and should have increasingly, a helpful influence. The complexities of our modern life have brought into play rules of conduct which demand for their enforcement new machinery, and it results that a host of controversies as to public and private right are not being decided in courts. The multiplication of administrative agencies is the outstanding characteristic of our time. As I said some years ago, the demand for such agencies arises from "a deepening conviction of the impotency of legislatures with respect to some of the most important departments of law making. Complaints must be heard, expert investigations conducted, complex situations deliberately and impartially analyzed, and legislative rules intelligently adapted to a myriad of instances falling within a general class." Administrative agencies "informed by experience," and which have shown their capacity for dealing expertly with intricate problems, as, for example, in the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission, have won a very high degree of public respect. I notice that there is a tendency, in the desire to emphasize the importance of obtaining flexibility and expertness in particular classes of cases, to depreciate the work of the courts and by comparison to exalt administrative boards and commissions. Such efforts are shortsighted and are not in the interest of the suitable development of administrative agencies. It must be remembered that to the courts the community still looks for the standards of judicial conduct. The controversies within the range of administrative action may be different and extremely

important, and they may call for a particular type of experience and special methods of inquiry, but the spirit which should animate that action, if the administrative authority is to be properly exercised, must be the spirit of the just judge. Whatever the shortcomings of courts, and whatever the need of administrative bodies, it is still the courts which stand out as the exemplars of the tradition of independence and impartiality. This is because judicial institutions, as we understand and support them, have won their place and established their standards through the historic contest against the abuses of power. So far as it is humanly possible under the conditions of democratic organization, judges are as a class supposed to be removed from political influence, to be guided by principle and not by sentiment or passion, and habitually to adhere to the requirements of the law in a conscientious endeavor to ascertain and apply them. This tradition should be cherished and not weakened by disparaging the institutions which embody it. Judicial work also has the advantage that those who are responsible for its results are identified. The judge who decides stands before the public as responsible for the decision.

The community cannot afford to depreciate these accepted standards or to ignore the processes by which they are maintained. Administrative agencies, which we earnestly desire to succeed in discharging their important tasks according to the basic requirements of their authority, will achieve that end to the extent that they perform their work with the recognized responsibility which attaches to judges and with the impartiality and independence which is associated with the judicial office. Deliberation, fairness, conscientious appraisal of evidence, determinations according to the facts, and the impartial application of the law, whether the controversies are decided in the courts or in administrative tribunals, these are the safeguards of society. For the law is naught but words, save as the law is administered.

We cannot change human nature. We cannot expect perfection in the discharge of duty either in or out of courts.

But if we hold strongly to our standards, defects will gradually be remedied, delinquencies will be suitably rebuked, and the democratic ideal demanding equal justice under law will be more fully attained.

•

A PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE¹

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

President Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, gave this address as a National Commencement address over the NBC networks on Friday, June 18, 1937, at 8 15 P M Eastern daylight saving time. Its significance lies partly in its reflection of Hutchins' attitude toward the aims and methods of education. During the academic year of 1937-38 this able young educator criticized severely the trend in higher education in America. He urged greater emphasis upon a study of the classics. John's College in Maryland, of which Hutchins is a trustee, set up a curriculum embodying somewhat the Chicago President's educational philosophy.

I hope that you will never have a "philosophy of life." As I understand this phrase it means that one who says he has a philosophy of life has got himself adjusted to his environment. He is now prepared to compromise on any issue at any time. Injustice is all right. Brutality is all right. Fraud, corruption, dishonesty are all right. The only thing that is not all right is something that endangers the security of the individual in question, or that threatens his income, or damages his reputation. Peace in a vegetable sense and prosperity in a material sense are the aims of one who talks about his philosophy of life.

It is obvious that those who have the effrontery to call this attitude a philosophy of life are confused about what is good. They think that goods outside a person are those which determine his success. And since those goods can apparently be best obtained and retained by adjustment to the environment, that adjustment is usually rapid and complete. They forget that there are some things in every environment to which no honest man should ever adjust himself.

¹ By permission of the author.

Since you are about to proceed into direct and remorseless contact with the environment, we should try to determine on this occasion the kind of adjustment you should make to it. This means that we must decide what goods you should strive for. Clearly we should try to find some for you if we can that are stable, that are within your own powers, and that are higher goods to which lower ones are ordered. We should try, in short, to work out a human philosophy of life, valid for all men, something more than a set of dodges and devices developed by an individual to shirk the pain of thinking and of moral choice. The problem, then, is what are the goods that man should seek, not what should you think of to cheer yourself up when the baby is sick, or to appease your conscience when you have cheated a client or customer, or to reconcile yourself to the murder or starvation of helpless people in Spain or elsewhere.

We see at once that the goods that man should seek cannot be some of those to which men have been willing to devote their lives. They cannot be money, fame, or power. These goods are goods of fortune. Hence they cannot be achieved by your own efforts. If you want them it is probably wise for you to work as hard as possible and to be as intelligent as possible. But any man who has attained them must admit occasionally and to himself that his success has resulted largely from chance. The accidents of friendship, location, education, and birth have led as many men to wealth and glory as the practice of puritanism. Even if you have all the virtues and the highest kind of I.Q., you cannot be sure that society will give you your reward. On the contrary, there is some justification for the saying that society either corrupts its best men or kills them.

As goods of fortune external goods are, of course, goods of the moment. We have reason to know that men may see their money vanish without warning and through no fault of their own. We can hardly blame those who lost their property or their jobs in the last depression. Yet assets painfully accumulated through years and even

generations were swept away overnight. In our own time we have seen great political and military reputations explode with a frequency, rapidity, and spontaneity which must be discouraging to those who have set their hearts on similar reputations for themselves.

We know that there must be proportion in whatever goods there are. All men want all good things. But any reasonably mature infant knows that there is such a thing as too much food. The delights of domesticity do not blind us to the fact that it is possible to have too large a family, too many houses, and too much furniture in each room. We are clear that there must be proportion in regard to most external goods. The one we are most confused about is the one we have created ourselves, namely, money. There is no limit to its goodness; it is always good, and the more of it the better. Yet the question that was asked 2,500 years ago is still unanswerable, "How can that be wealth of which a man may have a great abundance and yet perish with hunger, like Midas in the fable, whose insatiable prayer turned everything that was set before him into gold?"

As there is a proportion of goods, so also is there an order of them. As work is for the sake of leisure, and war, if there is any excuse for it, is for the sake of peace; as the body is trained for the sake of healthy appetites, and healthy appetites for the sake of the mind, so external goods are for the sake of something else. That they are good no one can deny. But they are not good in themselves and there are other goods beyond them. They are means and not ends. Most people will admit this, but when they say, "I have to earn a living first. When I am able to live then I will think about higher things." This doctrine of one thing at a time, this theory of successive justification is gross confusion of means and ends. Our way of life is distorted from the first unless we see the end from the first. In classical and mediaeval language the end of human action is the first principle of human action. We must know the end to understand the beginning we should make.

The modern state suffers from the same confusion about the role of external goods and about means and ends that afflict its citizens.

The true state is not organized for economic purposes, or for military purposes, or for the purpose of multiplying the population. It is not organized to achieve influence or empire. Least of all is it organized as an end in itself. It is organized to obtain for all its citizens, in the measure that they can partake of them, the goods we are seeking for you.

I hasten to add that these goods may be achieved only in a political society. The completely isolated individual is, in the ancient phrase, either a beast or a god; he is not a man. The good of the community, moreover, is higher than the good of the citizen, so that it is in the nature of things that he should surrender his temporal good and even his life for the welfare of the community, and that social life should impose upon him many restraints and sacrifices. Still the state exists for man, not man for the state. The totalitarian state is a perversion and a monstrosity. The state which demands that its people think what it tells them to think, the state which holds that the person is a part of the state and nothing else has no claim to the name. It is an organization of force.

The methods by which a political society tries to preserve its character are in general two: the laws and the educational system. If, for example, a country has adopted an imperialistic policy, the laws will tend to promote it, and there will be a lot of talk in the schools about manifest destiny and the white man's burden. So the state anxious for wealth or glory or the elevation of the national character will adapt its laws and educational system to the end it has in view.

The state can be no better than the citizens who compose it. But the citizens are made better or worse by the laws and education of the state. Thus the character of the citizens both forms and is formed by the character of the state.

Here we come to understand the role of leadership. Even in bad states good men may arise. In the course of history some countries have grown better rather than worse, and none has ever stayed the same over any considerable period of time. The changes that have taken place in them are not wholly fortuitous. They have resulted in part at least from the deliberate activities of people. The improvement of the American educational system, of the national character, and of the government of this country must depend in some degree on our ability to find leaders who understand what the good for man and hence for the state may be.

The college and university graduates of the United States are a minute fraction of the population. They have enjoyed, and not wholly at their own expense, opportunities far beyond their contemporaries. We cannot suppose that the community has provided the vast funds consumed by this enterprise in order to give students an agreeable vacation from their families and pleasant postponement of the task of earning a living. No, the community has had a child-like faith that from institutions of learning some leadership might emerge. The results to date have hardly justified the ecstatic hopes of Thomas Jefferson and others a century and a half ago. You may have heard that your generation is the hope of America. Perhaps it is; mine used to be. But if your generation makes no better use of its education than mine has there is little hope that the millenium will soon arrive, or if it does that education will have been responsible for its coming. Taking the country over there is little evidence that its college and university graduates as such have ever done, said, or even thought anything which suggested that they could be singled out to lead the way in improving the education, government, or character of our people. Since they are, we must suppose, our best men, and since we know that few of them have been killed, we must assume that they have been corrupted. They must have developed a philosophy of life.

The goods which are stable, which are within your power, the goods to which external and bodily goods are ordered, are the goods of the character and the mind. They are the main constituent of any abiding happiness. They are the insignia as well of the true state. The true state seeks the common good. It tries to secure happiness for all to the degree to which they can participate in it. Since the main constituent of happiness is intellectual and moral excellence, only a state which promotes intellectual and moral excellence can promote the common good and be a true state. It is the duty of the citizen to lead the good life. The state exists for the sake of this life.

The object of your education has been to help you form moral and intellectual habits of the sort that lead to excellence. But you have been practicing them in relatively sheltered surroundings. As habits are formed by acting in a certain way, so they are lost by ceasing to act in that way.

If you stop thinking when you receive your diploma, you will at length lose the capacity to think. If you begin to compromise, if your courage oozes when it costs something to fight, if you say, "Leave well enough alone," or "Don't rock the boat," or "I have a philosophy of life," then you will be lost to yourselves and to your country.

This country is endowed with material advantages beyond all others in the world. The genius of its people, the extent of its resources, and its impregnable position combine to suggest that it is equipped to be the ideal state for which antiquity yearned, that state which added to such advantages the noblest gifts of the intellect and character and the will to live for their exercise in every relation of life, and whose education, institutions, and laws developed those gifts and called them into full play. Is it too much to hope that the United States may yet achieve this ideal? Perhaps it may do so if you and your successors can see and hold fast that which is good. If you can, you will earn the blessings of your Alma Mater and at the last the gratitude of your country.

THE SCIENCE OF BETTER LIVING¹

OWEN D. YOUNG

Owen D. Young gave this talk before the Purdue Institute of American Policy and Technology, on June 28, 1937. It may be analyzed as a representative example of a business address and as expressing the business philosophy of one of America's leading industrial leaders. Mr. Young has long been popular as a speaker before civic and educational groups. This address may be profitably compared with business speeches given during the period, 1937-38, by such leaders as C. M. Chester, President of the National Association of Manufacturers, Merle Thorpe, editor of the *Nation's Business*, W. J. Cameron, of the Ford Motor Company, G. H. Gallup, of the American Institute of Public Opinion. This speech may also be regarded as similar in type to Ackerman's "The Role of the Press as a Factor in Public Opinion and Economy Changes."

Two years ago when I spoke at Purdue on the Science of Better Living, the meeting was sponsored by the Purdue Research Foundation Homes Conference. Naturally, with that background, I thought of better living in terms of housing. Today I come again to speak on the same subject at an institute which is considering the whole range of American policy and technology. Against such a background the title "Science of Better Living" takes on much larger proportions.

Such a comprehensive designation as the Science of Better Living might range anywhere from the smashing of the atom to the enlargement of the Supreme Court. It might even include consideration of the ancient ditty:

The rain it falleth on the just,
And on the unjust feller,
But mainly on the just, because
The unjust has the just's umbreller.

The Science of Better Living, however, projected against the background of American policy and technology, may well be

¹ By permission of the author.

translated to mean the discovery of ways to increase our goods and services over what we now have or have ever had, and to secure better distribution of them.

Let me say at once that in my judgment better living for all the people will be aided but little by a redistribution of what we now have. In an article in the current *Yale Review*, Mr. A. A. Berle, Jr., after careful analysis, points out that two-thirds of the national income is paid to employees, that the overwhelming bulk of this goes to the lower bracket groups, and that another one-sixth of the national income goes to individual enterprises such as farmers, small storekeepers and the like, leaving only one-sixth for compensation to capital. Mr. Berle concludes his article by saying:

The real object must be increase in the national income . . . The job is to level up far more than to level down. Distribution is one problem, but if the ultimate goal is to be reached there must be a great deal more to distribute.

Our thought during the past few years has been largely given to restoring rather than to expanding production. To that end, to put it generally, we have taken accumulated purchasing power from those who have an excess over present needs and redistributed it to those having little or none. By that method we maintained a reasonable minimum production of consumer goods and secondarily we restored slowly the production of capital goods. That procedure was an expedient to meet an emergency. It was an effort to maintain a low standard of living during a great depression. Now that the emergency is over, we face squarely the question of how to get a better living than we have ever had. Are we to try to get it by cooperation and persuasion thru a peaceful evolution, or by force and revolution? That is the challenge to the Science of Better Living.

H. G. Wells, shortly after the close of the war, put the matter prophetically in these terms:

In one way or another it seems inevitable now that the new standard of well-being which the mechanical revolution of the last century has rendered possible, should become the standard of life. Revolution is conditional upon public discomfort. Social peace

is impossible without a rapid amelioration of the needless discomforts of the present time. A rapid resort to willing service and social reconstruction on the part of those who own and rule, or else a world-wide social revolution leading toward an equalization of conditions and an attempt to secure comfort on new and untried lines, seem now to be the only alternatives before mankind. The choice which route shall be taken lies, we believe, in western Europe and still more so in America, with the educated, possessing and influential classes. The former route demands much sacrifice, for prosperous people in particular, a voluntary assumption of public duties and a voluntary acceptance of class discipline and self-denial; the latter may take an indefinite time to traverse, it will certainly be a very destructive and bloody process, and whether it will lead to a new and better state of affairs at last is questionable. A social revolution, if ultimately the western European states blunder into it, may prove to be a process extending over centuries, it may involve a social breakdown as complete as that of the Roman Empire, and it may necessitate as slow a recuperation.

I am happy to say that our leadership in America, both political and lay, is sensitive to this great issue. All people wish the problem solved. How are we to do it peacefully?

May I suggest that first we make a fair appraisal of what has been done; second, that we collect adequate facts and submit them to methodical study for the projection of our future course; third, that we marshal the irresistible force of good will and its resultant—good manners—in our procedure.

On the first point, we sadly need to re-establish in the minds of the people of this nation some true appreciation of what has been done. Their momentary habit is to blame the economic system and its leaders for all their troubles. Their simplest remedies range all the way from smashing the machine to killing off the leaders. I know the defects of the system. I am not unaware of the unfortunate failures of some of its leaders. But I venture to suggest that if our motor car stalls and we really want to get to our destination quickly, it would be wiser not to take a sledge hammer, smash the machine and murder the chauffeur. It would probably be the part of wisdom to readjust the carburetor and see if we could not get on our way, and then to make sure that that particular defect should not occur again.

I am sure that most people believe today that the preceding generation did a bad job economically. I do not share that view. If, as is estimated by the National Bureau of Economic Research, our national income was increased from \$27,600,000,000 in 1909 to \$86,000,000,000 in 1929—more than three times—if at the end of that period we had succeeded in distributing approximately five-sixths of that income to employees and independent operators like farmers and small business men, we ought not to be too severely critical of the economic management of the preceding generation. If the present, and those following, do as well both in production and distribution, there is real ground for hope that even the very high living standards to which we now aspire can be met.

The preceding generation can perhaps be more justly criticized for its lack of social outlook and for its political mismanagement. It forgot, for example, that in a period of great expansion of the national wealth, some would accumulate great fortunes, and that among them would be men who had rendered no contribution to the national wealth comparable to their own gains. Great fortunes, unfairly made, transmissible indefinitely to descendants, were humanly sure to excite the envy of the great mass of people struggling for a living. The fact that their distribution would have meant little to each did not draw the fire. Such conditions were sure to cause trouble when a depression came and men could not get a living. And so they have. So now, that great mass, conscious of its power in a democracy, is proceeding to take all fortunes away, and in its bad temper it is threatening not only all existing property rights but is impatient even of the time-honored restraints which a democracy for its own protection has imposed upon itself.

Reasonable social and political foresight and adequate recollection of the common law would have avoided such an outcome. If research had been as keen in the social sciences as it was in the physical; if men had put the same thought and effort toward providing wise government as they did toward increasing the national income, such a result might

have been avoided. My point, however, is not to indict men of an earlier generation for their lack of foresight, but emphasize the fact that our economic system is much better than it is generally thought to be. What it needs most is what the President has so often called attention to—that is, the control of that small percentage who misuse our economic machinery to gain something for which they return either no equivalent or no fair one. What the economic system fears most is that in the bad temper of these times we shall impair the energy and initiative of the great majority in our effort to outlaw the undesirable minority.

Certainly we need to see to it that our factory system is better assimilated socially and politically. Certainly we need to see to it that too much concentration of power in private hands should not become a political menace to the state. Certainly we need to see to it that instability of jobs and insecurity for masses of workers should be overcome. And certainly we need to see to it that all this is accomplished not by giving men less freedom but giving them more. Certainly we need to see to it that it is done by democratic methods. Certainly we need a fair appraisal of what we have, not a misappraisal. Then we need careful study of what to do, and most of all we need to use the impersonal and objective scientific method.

President Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, recently explained the scientific method by telling of a little girl who asked her mother why bunny's nose was shiny. It was the end of a long day, and the mother, who had been besieged with many questions, impatiently answered that she did not know, whereupon the little girl said: "I know—it's because his powder puff is in the wrong place." The distinguished president of that great scientific school pointed out that, after all, it displayed on the part of the little girl an intuitive appreciation of the scientific method, which involves first, keen observation, second the marshalling of facts, and third a satisfactory working hypothesis—proclaimed in this case without undue inhibitions.

Never before have we had so many working hypotheses, each of which is satisfactory to its author. We need the scientific method to take emotion out of our observations, to take color out of our facts, to take rancor and envy and prejudice and reaction out of our working hypotheses, to insist that we respect the historical record of what has been done, to demand that we be free from the shackles of what men have thought could not be done. Dr. Willis R. Whitney of the General Electric Research Laboratory recently said: "Some men have thousands of reasons why they can not do what they want to, when all they need is one reason why they can."

The utility of this method has long been recognized in industry. A generation ago, production was going on, there were people who were thinking about special problems; but there came a time when a few farsighted men saw the need for organized research under the direction of specialists if the expanding needs of the future were to be fully met. The course of civilization seems always to be from the simple to the complex. Its nature, said Montesquieu, is to make the superfluous useful and the useful necessary. In one way and another we accumulate a multitude of facts, and the need arises for synthesis and reconciliation. And so in other fields, from time to time, we have to establish organizations whose job it is, if they are scientific, to classify the facts, to recognize their sequence and relative significance, and to form judgments on the basis of these facts unbiased by personal feeling or private interest.

I congratulate Purdue and you, President Elliott, on being among the first to conceive and put into practice research in housing. You already have demonstrated how much need there is for such a service. We need homes in this country not alone to avoid the insecurity of tenancy and the fear of the landlord, but even more to establish and protect the independence of the individual. Every generation should be reminded of what William Pitt said in his speech on the Excise Bill: "The poorest man in his cottage may bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail, its roof may shake, the wind may blow through it, the storms may enter, the rain

may enter, but the King of England can not enter. All his forces dare not cross the threshold . . . " It is not the emotion of the dreamer that will eliminate slums, valuable as that may be in dramatizing for us the need for action. It is not even the credit of the government, helpful as that may be in initiating action. In the last analysis, it is the work of a group of specialists such as you have here at Purdue, a program of community planning, a scientific study of such practical matters as taxation and cost reduction, and such a spirit of fair approach that slums and public opinion can not live together in the same community.

Yes, we need an understandable picture of what we can wisely do for our future guidance. I do not think that the art of the Cubist will help us much. Lord Riverdale told the story, when he was in this country last, of being taken to see a Cubist picture. Not being able to understand it well, he asked what it was intended to portray. "A cow eating grass," was the reply. Riverdale asked, "Where is the grass?" "The cow ate it up," he was told. "Well," asked Riverdale, "where is the cow?" The answer was that the cow would not stay where there wasn't any grass! That kind of picture will not help us, and I humbly suggest that too many of them are being painted in these days.

And now may I suggest that we proceed with good will and good manners. I predict that we shall never achieve better living by resort to bad feeling and resultant bad manners unless we wish to attempt it through a revolution by war. The technique of evolution by peace must be much the reverse of that of war. In order to advance toward better living, we must enlist men in a unified drive against the inertia of things that are. Never before have the times been so ripe, for in things as they are the past seven years have disclosed many enemies to better living. Never before has there been such a wide realization of that fact and a willingness to join in a unified advance. Under such conditions is it not tragic to promote factional fights within the ranks?

I am sorry to say that it seems to me that the same leadership that showed itself so sensitive in detecting problems is becoming more and more insensitive to the overwhelming power of good will and good manners in solving them. The one is the embodiment of the other and is an irresistible agency in accomplishing great purposes.

I submit that it is not good manners to fan the flames of envy and hatred, or to create prejudices and class consciousness in America. I submit that it is not good manners to try to settle industrial disputes by civil war. I submit, after three people have lived long in the same house together, each with defined duties, that it is not good manners for two to conspire against the third.

Much has been done with good manners in the past five years. We have mobilized our common credit for relief of human suffering and to conserve our economic mechanism in banking, industry, and agriculture. We did it on the whole gladly, for the objective was a common aim. Only methods were in controversy, and even they were readily accepted, except in the few cases when there was in fact, or felt to be, an unworthy animus riding on a worthy cause.

We need today inspiration, not irritation. We need education, not seduction or coercion. We need appreciation of the good that is, not an assumption that all is evil. We need research that we may know more, not ignorance that we may work more. We need respect, not cynicism. We need faith, not hopelessness. We need stability to make homes and keep them. We need expansion, not mere restoration of resources, so that more than the upper third of our population may have homes. We need more things, more widely distributed, with good manners. We need what Whitman saw after reading Hegel:

Roaming in thought over the Universe, I saw
The little that is
Good steadily hastening towards immortality.
And the vast all that is called Evil I saw
hastening to merge itself and become lost and
dead.

THE ROLE OF THE PRESS AS A FACTOR IN PUBLIC OPINION AND ECONOMIC CHANGES¹

CARL W. ACKERMAN

Dean Carl W. Ackerman, of the Graduate School of Journalism of Columbia University, gave this address at the twenty-first annual meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on Thursday, May 27, 1937, at five P. M. Prof. Ackerman has given several notable speeches in support of freedom of the press. The present talk should be viewed as one of the more penetrating expositions of the current controversy covering the limits of a free press and of free expression of public opinion.

We are all aware, I think, of a new force in public affairs. That force, which we call public opinion, is directly related to economic and social changes in the United States and throughout the world. This is a challenging situation because practically all the information available anywhere resolves itself into someone's opinion of public opinion.

I wish to emphasize those two points at the beginning. Public opinion is a literally stupendous force which many of us believe is determining the course of civilization, while our knowledge of how it functions, how it is influenced, how it is related to the press and radio, whether on specific issues its source is Washington, Moscow, Rome or in the homes of workers and farmers, is largely a matter of personal observation and opinion.

Since 1911 I have had some opportunity of observing, reporting and studying public opinion thruout the United States and in thirty-four foreign countries. It has been my good fortune to have had this experience as a newspaper

¹ By permission of the author

man, as a public relations officer of several large corporations and as an educator. The substance of this experience may be stated in one proposition: That the time has come for journalism, industry and education to cooperate in bringing about a transition from casual observation to a scientific study of public opinion. That is the only justification for the acceptance of your hospitality and for the privilege of participating on your program.

One significant aspect of contemporary affairs is the widespread interest in the printed and the spoken word. From the White House to the mines and farms, from the mills and factories to executive offices of industry, labor and finance, the press and the radio are actively in the consciousness of the people.

This interest is much deeper than a routine desire for news and entertainment. It is fundamentally related to economic and social changes in the United States and abroad. Thru the press and the radio, ideas are traveling with the speed and force of lightning. The printed and the spoken word are the agencies of public communication. Mankind is thinking and is articulate. This makes public opinion today probably the most powerful force in world affairs. Because it affects all of us personally, because it is directly related to the problems of management and the development of industry, and their relation to our national economy, we are all searching for information upon which we can base a judgment and plan a course of action. Industry, journalism and education have a common interest in public opinion because they are composed of independent units dependent upon democratic institutions.

If politics were the only approach to an understanding of public opinion and if participation in political party activities were the sole means of influencing the trends of public thinking and action, our chance of escaping control of our national affairs by either the extreme right or the radical left would be too limited to be comfortable. The trend of public thinking appears to be in the direction of the

socialization of activity and the centralization of authority. It is doubtful, I think, whether property rights and liberty, as we have been considering them, can be successfully defended, in the future, in the courts or before legislative assemblies. It is problematical whether the momentum of mass opinion can be stopped in Washington, either at the White House or by the United States Supreme Court. Whether this movement originated in the capital or because of capitalism, is an academic political question it is not my prerogative to debate.

In discussing the role of the press as a factor in public opinion and economic changes, I am confronted with the realities of today and the trends leading to tomorrow. These manifestations indicate that history today is being made in the realm of public thought and that the future character of our property rights and liberties will be determined by public opinion.

This would be a terrifying picture if politics were the only approach to an understanding of mass opinion, or if free publicity in the press or on the radio, the platform and the screen were the only instrumentalities available to religion, education, industry and the professions to maintain their respective rights in democracy.

Our perspective of the fundamental problem involved will be clearer, I think, if we eradicate from our minds the fixed notion of so many business men that publicity, public relations and public opinion are synonymous. I am not concerned here with the desirability or the technique of obtaining favorable publicity for individual leaders or with the building of good will for industry. Our concern, it seems to me, should be with the causes of the trend toward socialization and centralization; with the reasons for the momentum of mass opinion; with the methods which have been used and are being utilized to separate our people into suspicious and hostile groups. The national state of mind which considers the opinions of citizens outside of government, labor and agriculture as being dominated by selfish interests and motives and thereby contrary to the public welfare is becom-

ing as dangerous to democracy as the united front of the totalitarian state. Therefore, the whole relationship of public opinion to recent changes in the economic policies and the administrative practices of government is of the greatest moment to all of us.

Until the outbreak of the World war it was everywhere assumed that public opinion, clarified by general education, assured the continuation of representative government and free institutions in the United States. Democracy was regarded as public opinion made dynamic by free speech. Since the armistice, altho the circulation of newspapers and periodicals has increased and radio broadcasting has expanded, these confident assumptions are challenged or denied.

Is this because public opinion has been turned from its true purpose or is it because public opinion has been suppressed? If public opinion simply is being or has been suppressed and, if liberated, would be expressed again as it was prior to 1914 in devotion to the same ideals, then our task is one of uncovering and defeating the influences that stifle public opinion and thereby destroy free institutions. If, on the other hand, public opinion has been turned to the willing acceptance of the Fascist or the Communist theory of the state, then it is of the utmost importance to study the stimuli and their relation to the press and the radio.

The approach to the study of the larger aspects of public opinion must, for these reasons cover more than the mere physical channels or the utilization of these channels by governments or by militant minorities. There must be a scientific study. These problems cannot be solved by casual observation, or by the expansion of industrial public relations, or by the concentration of legal forces in Washington or by multiplying the readers of Kent, Thompson, Sokolsky and Lippmann or by group meetings.

These problems are not exclusively American. In South America, in the Orient, in the Scandinavian countries, Holland, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and the British Empire

public opinion is one of the important national concerns. In a lecture at the University College of Wales recently Professor E. H. Carr discussed it in relation to foreign policies and peace.

"The intellectual," he said, "has an immense role to fill as the leader of public opinion. But in order to lead it, he must keep in touch with it. The political thinking of the intellectual once it divorces itself from the political thinking of the man in the street, is sterile."

Is it not possible that one of the reasons for the cleavage of public opinion in this country is the sterility of individual opinions of public opinion?

To develop the proposition that journalism, industry and education should cooperate in bringing about the transition from casual observation and opinion to a scientific study of public opinion, I shall endeavor to present my point of view by examining two specific situations.

I. The relation of the government, particularly the White House, to the press and the radio as factors in public opinion and economic and social changes;

II. The relations between business and journalism.

In 1933 and 1934 when the newspaper publishers and editors of the United States believed that the freedom of the press was endangered by the proposed NRA code, they received no support from education, religion, the professions or industry. They fought alone, without aid or comfort from their readers or advertisers, and were widely accused of the desire to protect the publishing industry by the blanket application of the Bill of Rights. In the end they succeeded in obtaining a freedom of the press provision in the code. At the time it was repeatedly pointed out by the newspapers that the government was building a formidable publicity machine which was destined to have a profound influence upon public opinion. This machine was organized to serve every opinion-making group in the country, and to utilize the press, the radio, the screen, and the public forum. How many business men sensed the significance of this warning

at that time, when public emotion was being forged into public opinion?

This situation had an important bearing on the relation of the press to public opinion, on the relation of the White House to the press and the newspaper publishers to politics. In this complex situation the President discovered, if he did not know it, that he could circumvent the political and personal partisanship of the publishers, by three equally effective and coordinated courses of action. First, by creating and dominating the news of the day, secondly by utilizing the radio for public addresses, and thirdly by building up in the public mind the thought that there was a distinction between what was printed about the President and what he himself said.

It is unnecessary to expand these statements other than to direct attention to a fundamental factor common to all the instrumentalities of public communication, namely, that news, editorial comment and interpretation, radio news broadcasting, comment and interpretation, and news-reel releases, all are chiefly concerned with the newest development of timely public interest. By giving thought to this factor and by acting accordingly, the President's point of view, his intentions and his arguments were brought to the attention of the people daily. This situation prevailed thruout the first administration and the campaign.

I have outlined this relationship between the government and public opinion not because of the political implications but because the role of the press in public opinion must be considered first of all from the standpoint of the distribution of news. The press is not the few newspapers you or I read, or the two or three large chains of daily newspapers. The press consists of nearly two thousand independent units and upward of eleven thousand independent weekly newspapers. It is also three large press associations and correspondents and syndicates serving dailies and weeklies with the newest developments of timely public interest. The influence of the daily flow of news is undoubtedly very great

because statisticians can chart, with considerable degree of accuracy, the impact of the news on public opinion.

Since the election there has been considerable discussion of the question of the influence of the press because it is claimed that the great majority of daily newspapers opposed President Roosevelt's re-election. These claims are largely based upon publisher opposition, without giving any weight to the character and distribution of news. The claims can be disproved by additional evidence. First, there is the obvious fact that there is a difference between the number of newspapers which opposed the President and their circulation which is the point of public contact. Secondly, thruout the campaign the President averaged a larger share of editorial support, even in the newspapers whose owner's were opposing him, because the bulk of editorial comment was based upon news developments not upon partisan or personal politics. Thirdly, the Gallup studies of public opinion thruout the campaign revealed that the people were making their decisions along economic, rather than political lines. By separating editorials into these classifications, a study of editorial comment in several hundred newspapers thruout one month of the campaign, showed that the President's arguments dominated the editorial interpretations and comment.

It would be most unwise, I think, for business men to conclude that President Roosevelt's re-election was due to a decline in the public influence of the press.

Futhermore, in 1936 and at the present time, the daily editorial reiteration of the DAILY NEWS is having probably as profound influence on public opinion and economic and social changes in New York City as the activities of the Federal government. If you will read the DAILY NEWS editorials which reach a larger daily audience than the TIMES, HERALD TRIBUNE, WORLD TELEGRAM and SUN combined, I think you will agree with me that circulation is a better basis for measuring the influence of the press on the thinking of mankind, than the addition of publication units, even

when they are as eminent and powerful as the four I mentioned.

"We are making history in these days faster than ever before," James Truslow Adams said recently. Personally, I think it is being made in the realm of public thought and the newspapers, and radio broadcasting stations which newspapers own and operate, are having a literally stupendous influence. But what business men should have is not my opinion based on personal observation but the facts, which can be obtained thru scientific study. What industry needs are facts which scientific research in the field of public opinion will bring to light.

II

The second specific situation to be examined is the relation between business and journalism. Newspapers also need more facts about public opinion and their own obligations and responsibilities to the public. Studies should be made of the impact of news and editorial policies and practices on the social and economic consciousness of the people.

Every citizen in the United States today is participating in a world war of ideas. This war may be as destructive of property rights and individual freedom, of institutions and of family life as a war involving material resources. In this modern warfare the printed and spoken word may in the end be the decisive weapons. Therefore, every man or woman who reports, edits or interprets facts and ideas today which are directly or indirectly related to the social and the political sciences, has a public responsibility superior to either professional or commercial interests. In the case of democratic nations, this involves the necessity for new orientation within the profession and industry of journalism because the claim of the press in totalitarian states that it is economically free is known and is being discussed in the United States. As public opinion in this country is divided on economic lines this foreign argument may someday be

used effectively to substitute economic freedom of the press for our present interpretation of the Bill of Rights.

Unfortunately, both for the press and for the people, newspaper publishers, editors and writers are sensitive to criticism of their practices and policies. This lack of informed public criticism retards professional progress because it places the necessity for changes largely on a circulation or advertising basis. Unfortunately, also, as you are doubtless aware, no business man today would dare to criticize, even in a friendly way, journalistic practices and judgment which result so frequently in inaccuracies and distortion.

This relationship between business and journalism, between the church, the state and the professions and journalism must be changed or the movement toward the socialization of activity and the centralization of authority will dispose of a free press. And when that comes, the freedom of business and of religion will follow.

I mentioned inaccuracies and distortion. These are harsh words. Because of my admiration for the achievements of the press, for the character and integrity of the personnel, and my faith in the future of the profession, I use those words only because the responsibility for discussing the role of the press imposes the obligation of criticism as well as defense. Most of the inaccuracies today are due to carelessness or to traditional news practices. Only an insignificant fraction of the inaccuracies is due to any other cause. The distortion of news is largely due to re-write practices within newspaper offices resulting all too frequently in incorrect emphasis upon incidental facts or expressions of opinion which convey, under prevailing headline practices, a distorted perspective of the subject matter or the individual involved.

Every time specific instances have been brought to my attention and I have investigated them, I have absolved the individual from any intentional wrongdoing. The faults of the press today are due to the prevailing system of reporting, rewriting, headline writing and make-up. These involve technical problems as much as they do news judgment and editorial policies.

If inaccuracies and distortion were solely due to the press these matters could be dealt with by newspaper men behind closed doors and could be changed within a measurable period of time. But the politician, the business man, the preacher and teacher, the labor leader, the lecturer, the movie star, the racketeer, the sportsman, the speculator, the doctor, the lawyer, the engineer and in every community federal, state and local public officials, legislative, executive and judicial departments are all competing with each other for public attention. To achieve their objective they "create news." In many instances they are themselves responsible for inaccuracies and distortion. They overemphasize their own facts and overplay or exaggerate their own expressions of opinions for publicity purposes. Newspaper men are confronted every day by such a volume of material that editing and publishing is an endless vigil to sift intelligible news from this glut of matter. If you could see what is discarded daily by a single newspaper or press association I think you would be amazed to find how good the selection really is when compared with the material submitted for publication.

But whether the selection is good or bad, the prevailing relationship between business and journalism results in too many inaccuracies and in too frequent instances of distortion. During periods of industrial disorder the trend of the news and photographic display tends to become so fixed to one point of view, as to raise a serious question in regard to the objectivity of the press. Should there not be a scientific study of this whole situation to determine the causes and the effects of the relationships between industry and journalism which at present may be accelerating the thinking of mankind in a direction hostile to the freedom of business and of the press? Scientific research, it seems to me, gives the only promise for a true perspective of our common problems. They cannot be accurately analyzed by casual observation or solved by emergency action. To understand the causes of the present momentum for economic and social changes we must study the press and the radio, not from the superficial point of view of how to utilize them to build good

will for industry, or to maintain our individual or group philosophies, but from the standpoint of their relationship and their responsibilities to the thinking of mankind. The continuation of the status quo will lead inevitably to chaos or to centralized control. Based upon our present knowledge of public opinion we cannot chart a course to reach a predetermined goal. We all have faith in scientific research in materials and matter. Is it not time for us to attempt a scientific approach to the study of the intangibles and the imponderables of public opinion which are responsible for the mass movement demanding hasty action and immediate change?

Politics cannot stop the momentum of mass thought in any direction to the right or to the left. Politicians can only yield. Science can and must lead. The hope for our civilization to escape the disastrous consequences of centralized authority and expression, is for science to endeavor to substitute the discipline of scientific knowledge for the opportunism of politics.

Science holds the key to the future of independent industry as well as to the freedom of the press. Industry and the people have a common interest in the printed and spoken word. Science can bring them together more rapidly and more peacefully than economic arguments or political action because science is fundamentally impartial, impersonal and reliable.

This, I think, is a realizable ideal.

Twenty-four years ago Dr. Edwin E. Slosson, author of "Creative Chemistry" and one of the pioneer interpreters of science, lectured at the School of Journalism on the necessity for an understanding between science and the press. Science, he repeated, is news, not the freakish and the sensational stories which were currently printed, but the truth about science and scientists. In the intervening years there was a complete change in the perspective of the press and of science. Scientific developments and the interpretation of science moved simultaneously in the same direction, contrib-

uting, thru cooperation, to the social and economic welfare of mankind. This year Columbia University awarded the Pulitzer prize for reporting to five reporters for their distinguished services to science at the Harvard University Tercentenary. Within a brief span of years, Dr. Slosson's ideal was realized.

It is my conviction that a similar change can be brought about between industry and journalism. Thru cooperation and with the aid of science, I think the role of the press as a factor in public opinion and economic and social changes can be of infinite benefit to mankind.

BEING CIVILIZED TO DEATH¹

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, of the Riverside Church, New York City, delivered this Commencement Address to the students of Johns Hopkins University, at Baltimore, Maryland, on June 7, 1937. Dr. Fosdick is widely regarded as America's most prominent preacher.

The present example is to be analyzed as a sermon and should be compared and contrasted with such notable sermons of the period of 1937-38 as those delivered by Ralph Sockman, Joseph Fort Newton, Charles Reynolds Brown, Frederick F. Shannon and Charles W. Gilkey.

In a western New York community stands a house, still occupied, the original portion of which was a log cabin. That log cabin my great grandfather built. Hardly three generations are represented in the years that have passed since then and yet how startling have the changes been! When my grandsire played as a lad about a log cabin, there was not anywhere in the world a railroad or a telephone or a telegraph. There were no matches to light fires with or gas or coal ranges to light them in. There were no elevators or refrigerators, no plumbing, no electric lights, no sewing machines, no furnaces. Letters were written with quill pens because steel pens had not been invented, and were dried with sand because blotting paper did not exist. And, of course, there were no Victrolas, radios, typewriters, bicycles, automobiles, or airplanes. With what absorbed preoccupation during three generations has mankind been engaged in inventing and producing the external paraphernalia of civilization!

Let us phrase the situation in the convenient terms used by sociologists. Man's life can be divided into two distin-

¹ *Successful Christian Living*. Harper and Bros. New York, 1937, p. 65-74. By permission of the author and special arrangement with the publishers.

guishable though closely interrelated areas, civilization and culture. Civilization is the complex of devices, mechanisms, techniques, and instrumentalities by means of which we live. Culture is the realm of spiritual ends, expressed in art, literature, morals, and religion, for which at our best we live. Civilization is made up of things which we utilize to get something else. Culture is made up of values which we desire for their own sakes. Civilization is what we use. Culture is what we are.

For three lifetimes we have been busily engaged in building a civilization, a vast complex of implements by means of which to live, but we have not with any similar intelligence and care been engaged in creating a culture of spiritual ends, personal and social, for which to live. In the mordant phrase of G. Lowes Dickinson, we have been "contemptuous of ideas but amorous of devices," till now mankind stands, its hands filled with devices, but as bewildered and unhappy as mankind has been in centuries. Listen to Jesus, then, tho he did live nearly two thousand years ago, speaking as if to us: "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth"; "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul."

The meaning of such words, applied to individuals, is clear but today they constitute a searching diagnosis of our social ills. Tho mankind amass things without end, achieving even the marvelous apparatus of modern civilization, that alone is pathetically not enough. Ingenious devices to live by, worth-while ends to live for, a material civilization without a soul to guide it, as tho a magnificently furnished ship had no idea what port it was headed for—that situation underlies every lesser problem of mankind today.

In endeavoring to see the significance of this, consider first that here lies the explanation of the optimism which characterized our early American forefathers but which among us has commonly collapsed into disillusionment. We whose memories go well back into the nineteenth century recall

that, whatever else we Americans were then, we were optimistic. We were sure that we were continuously growing bigger and better. Progress was our real religion, in which if a man did not believe we thought him damned indeed. We lived in the time of the first telephones, the first express trains, the first uses of electricity, the first internal-combustion engines, the first of so many astonishing devices that life became an eager standing on tiptoe, wondering what new marvel would arrive tomorrow. So, when philosophers like Herbert Spencer told us that man's progress toward perfection was an inevitable necessity, we believed them. This illusion of progress so possessed us, from day laborers to philosophers, because all alike we had our eyes primarily upon one thing, civilization—the invention, production, utilization of the marvelous new apparatus of living. We were on our way then from the log-cabin stage to cities like New York. And because this multiplication of the means by which to live was our serious aim, we thought we were successfully headed toward a great end, and our life was pitched in an optimistic key.

Now, however, we have plunged headlong against a stubborn fact—all this boasted civilization we have gloried in is nothing but means, only implements to be utilized, and the more powerful the implements become the more insistently the question rises, on the answer to which man's destiny hangs: To what end will mankind use them? To that question civilization does not possess the answer. The answer to that question is not found in a nation's civilization but in its spiritual culture. For civilization is merely what we use; culture is what we are.

Some in those old days foresaw the *dénouement* we were headed for. Henry D. Thoreau, retreating to Walden Pond, watched from a distance the process we have just described and visited upon it a devastating comment. With all America busily engaged in producing the paraphernalia of living, he said, "improved means to an unimproved end." Thoreau was referring especially to the new and marvelous Atlantic cable,

concerning which he said, "The first news that will leak through into the broad, flapping American ear will be that the Princess Adelaide has the whooping cough." How many improved means to unimproved ends we have today! The phrase suggests not simply the way we can create the cinema and degrade morals with it, create the radio and give nonsense a wider hearing with it, create the automobile and implement gangsters with it, and the countless ways in which the old vulgarian and the old barbarian reach out controlling hands for the new devices. The phrase suggests also that society as a whole can so utilize the most amazing industrial equipment mankind ever had as to plunge millions into unemployment and penury, or, furnished with world-wide intercommunications, can make of them world wars, armed, moreover, with techniques that would cause the very devils in Milton's hell to blush with shame—"improved means," there is no doubt of that, but to an "unimproved end."

For three lifetimes we have been thus engaged in building civilization, as tho man's life could consist in the abundance of the apparatus which he uses. But this other realm, where man's real life lies, his spiritual culture—the profound faiths that alone give life intrinsic meaning, the great goals that give life direction—has often been popularly treated as a decoration, an afterthought, an addendum. And now the God of judgment speaks—The end of this road you are traveling is irretrievable perdition; if you love your lives and your children, recenter your attention; one thing supremely matters to mankind today, the quality of spiritual life which will use these amazing implements. What shall it profit a man or a nation or the race, to gain the whole world and lose the soul?

In the second place, consider that while, at first hearing, this diagnosis and prescription may seem rather general, the more closely one regards it the more intimately personal it becomes. One clear difference exists between civilization and culture. Civilization is easily handed down. Contrivances invented in one generation are taken for granted as

a matter of course in the next; they are improved, expanded, and they go marching on. The apparatus of civilization is easily transmissible. But a profound spiritual culture is not so. It must be reexperienced by every soul, its insights and devotions individually reproduced, its values inwardly possessed and assimilated. No one in my stead can love great music or as my surrogate and substitute possess Christ's spirit. There are no proxies for the soul. It happens, therefore, that while the apparatus of civilization piles up and moves on, there is an appalling lag in spiritual culture until mankind stands, as it stands today, with vast new implements to use and the old barbarian using them.

In our homes, for example, it is not difficult for parents to hand down to children the civilization developed in our time. The young take to Victrolas, radios, automobiles, and all the gadgets and devices of civilized society, as ducks to water. But not so simple is it to hand on to them profound spiritual culture. From the love of great music to the love of Christ and all he stands for, parents cannot give that to children as they give telephones and automobiles. The onward march of civilization and the appalling lag of spiritual culture are not simply a general problem; they constitute the problem in how many families here! The houses in which we live come from civilization but the homes for which we ought to live are the fruit of spiritual culture, and as one sees some houses and some homes within them the description holds good, "improved means to an unimproved end."

Far from being merely general, therefore, this truth knocks intimately on every door. From childhood we have heard of the dangers of wealth. That a rich man can hardly enter the kingdom of heaven we have been told as long as we can recall. But this truth rolls from us without appeal. We are not rich, we say; we must watch our step financially to get along at all; the least of our moral dangers is the peril of wealth. If, however, a man will cease thinking of his individual pocketbook and will think of his inevitable share in modern civilization's amazing opulence in things—mar-

velous, rapidly accumulating things, whose ingenuity outdoes the magic of Arabian Nights—he must feel the pertinence to himself of wealth's peril. See how millions of us live! The focus of our lives is in civilization; we are absorbed and centered in its material opulence; while spiritual culture, which alone gives life intrinsic dignity, worth, and meaning, is crowded out.

It is one thing to have an automobile—that is a part of civilization. It is another to be carried by it on a summer's day into the loveliness of the countryside and so to use the experience that one returns saying,

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures;
He leadeth me beside still waters.
He restoreth my soul

That is not a means to an end, but an end in itself. It is one thing to own a printed book—a marvelous civilized device. It is another thing so to use it that one knows the seer's meaning when he said that the greatest day in a man's life comes when he runs into a new idea. That is not a means to an end but an end in itself. It is one thing to share the great heritage of scientific inventions; it is another to share the greater heritage of the world's seers and prophets. The first is something we use; the second is something we are. And such is the hypnotic power of civilization's wealth in things that many a man, of lowly financial rating himself, may well face the warning, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" Indeed, some of us could talk sensibly to ourselves like this: Beware of too much civilization, too many gadgets and devices that surround life, impinge on it, steal its time, invade its privacy. Especially beware of the false impression which this accumulation of apparatus makes on men, as tho, because they can run cars, press buttons with almost magical results, tune in on the radio, and ride in airplanes, they must therefore be superior persons themselves.

Did some one here instinctively pity my grandfather because he lived in a log cabin? You may spare your pity.

Before he was thru he was Superintendent of Education of the city of Buffalo. Tho he did live in a meager civilization, he was himself a superior person, whereas the truth about multitudes of us amply apparatused moderns is, as the old Latins put it, *Propter vitam vivendi perdere causas*—in the process of life they lose the reason for living.

I wish I could bring the figure of Jesus up over the horizon of some soul here. His words have an applicability to us that he himself could never have foreseen. It is not simply the individual possession of money that misleads us, it is our common social possession of this apparatus of civilized society, as tho in that alone there were any hope, as tho that by itself alone did not present to man his most stupendous problem and peril. For even when we define "things" in terms of all this paraphernalia, man's life consisteth not in the abundance that he possesses.

In the third place, let us face the imminent impact of this truth on our present world. Not only vertically, from parents to children, is civilization easily transmissible; it is as well swiftly transmissible horizontally, from nation to nation and from race to race. Start a contrivance anywhere and in the long run it will be everywhere. Nothing is much more easy to copy than civilization. An illustrious example of this is Japan, which within hardly a generation has absorbed, mastered, and made her very own the characteristic techniques of Western society. It is inevitable, then—a most stupendous fact—that in the end we shall have one identical, world-wide civilization. But spiritual culture, the profound faiths that give life meaning, the moral ends to which this vast agglomeration of mighty implements will be devoted, has no such swiftness of transference. A man of realistic mind, therefore, who would not live in a fool's paradise, must confront the fact that a vast, single, world-wide civilization run by barbarian cultures means suicide. If ever mankind needed to cry, What must we do to be saved? it is today.

Do not, I beg of you, misinterpret this as discouragement. Upon the contrary, the positive assets in our present situation are very great. Professor Whitehead of Harvard truly says, "On the whole, the great ages have been unstable ages." Out of the wracked agony of disturbed generations man's greatest gains have come. Moreover, our modern problem is not handling weakness, as has often been the case in history, but handling power; and handling power, while dangerous, is promising. "The greater the civilization," says Professor MacIver, "the more numerous are the alternatives which are opened up to human endeavor." That is encouraging. In the log-cabin civilization, narrow limitations surrounded man's immediate possibilities, but in our new civilization doors of promise are open before man the like of which he never dreamed before. Nevertheless, we may not rest back comfortably upon these encouraging factors as tho they were self-operative. They are not. There is nothing automatic about them. "Power," said Alfred the Great, "is never a good, unless he be good that has it." Unless he be good that has it—that shifts the problem to the profound and central place where the destinies of mankind will be decided this next generation.

In 1876 Thomas Huxley visited America especially to speak at the new Johns Hopkins University, and this was his message: "I cannot say that I am in the slightest degree impressed by your bigness or your material resources, as such. Size is not grandeur, territory does not make a nation. The great issue, about which hangs a true sublimity, and the terror of overhanging fate, is, What are you going to do with all these things?" So today the wise man addresses himself to civilization as a whole. Not for a moment would one belittle the intelligence, skill, and devotion which have been invested in creating the apparatus of civilized society. But the predominant problem is no longer there. The apparatus of civilization will inevitably accumulate, pile up, march triumphantly on. If, however, we use all this agglomerated might for war we are irretrievably undone—

that is the inevitable problem. If we let it be utilized by selfish acquisitiveness in a dog-eat-dog economy, bloody revolution waits like Judgment Day—there the real problem confronts us. Man never had such a civilization to use; therefore man never so desperately needed a spiritual life to use it.

Finally, then, consider the responsibility which rests upon all agencies of the spiritual life, and especially upon us in the Christian churches. I know this sermon has been preached in so serious a mood that some souls, coming here for cheer and comfort, must have felt it dour. Yet all the time we have been pleading for man's happiness. We inventive moderns thought we knew better than Jesus did how to get that. We will give men happiness, we said. Bestow on them devices, gadgets, appliances, give them not only things but things made magical by harnessed power, and they will be happy. So we have furnished ourselves with civilization and in consequence multitudes of us are accurately portrayed by the cartoon in *Punch* where an irate parent on a public holiday at some English replica of Coney Island holds his tired and whimpering offspring by the ear and angrily demands, "Now then, are you going to enjoy yourself or shall I make you?" So foolish have we also been to suppose that happiness ever can consist in the abundance of the apparatus we employ.

A strange paradox is man's search for happiness. Francis of Assisi was the gay and wealthy son of a prosperous merchant, with ample means to live by, and he was not happy. Then he stripped his gay robes from him, espoused "The Lady Poverty," washed the sores of lepers, and made himself one with the famished poor. And lo! that Francis of Assisi preached joyously to his brothers the birds, sang the "Canticle of the Sun," and, incidentally, shook Christendom to its foundations. He found happiness at its residence, not in the means by which but in the ends for which he lived. I am not recommending literal copying of Saint Francis. To each generation its own way! But this is clear: not only

bad times in the social order but wretched times in the individual life lie ahead of us if we have merely a vast civilization and lack a profound spiritual culture.

We need not lack it. For hardly more than three lifetimes have we been so busily engaged building the apparatus of civilized life. That is not long. Nor is it to be expected that mankind will be so permanently insane as to absorb itself in providing improved means to unimproved ends. Already millions of ordinary folk look at the world with vision clarified by our imminent peril. The road we have been walking on leads to perdition. We have tried to civilize our apparatus of living till we are well-nigh civilized to death. The problem of our salvation lies elsewhere—in our spiritual culture. Ah, Church of Christ, what a clarion call you might sound in such a time as this! For while Jesus could help us very little in devising a civilization, who could help us half so much in creating a spiritual life to use it? And still he waits. What shall it profit—like the tolling of some great bell those ancient words sound on—What shall it profit if a man or a nation or the race gain this whole world and lose the soul?

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES¹

ACKERMAN, CARL WILLIAM (1890-). Born in Richmond, Indiana; attended the University of Chicago, 1910; A.B., Earlham College, 1911, A.M., 1917; B. Litt., Columbia University School of Journalism, 1913; director of foreign news service, Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, 1919-1921; president of Carl W. Ackerman, Incorporated (directing corporate public relations), 1921-1927; Dean, Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism since 1931; Author of *Germany, the Next Republic?*, 1917, *Biography of George Eastman*, 1930, and other books.

BORAH, WILLIAM EDGAR (1865-), Born in Fairfield, Illinois; educated at Southern Illinois Academy, University of Kansas; practiced law at Lyons, Kansas, 1890-1891, Boise, Idaho, since 1891; United States Senator from Idaho since 1907; Chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee since 1924; member of the Judiciary Committee and the Education and Labor Committee; opposed entrance of United States to League of Nations and World Court.

BUTLER, NICHOLAS MURRAY (1862-). Born in Elizabeth, New Jersey; A.B., Columbia, 1882, A.M., 1883, Ph.D., 1884; honorary degrees from many American and European Universities; President of Columbia since 1902; frequently a delegate to the Republican National Conventions; received Republican electoral vote for Vice-president of the United States, 1913; received 691½ votes from New York State as candidate for President of the United States, Republican National Convention, 1920; member or chairman of many committees, associations, and foundations for the advancement of education; awarded one-half of Nobel peace prize,

¹ The chief source for these notes is *Who's Who in America*.

1931; Author of *The Meaning of Education*, 1898, *Philosophy*, 1911, *A World in Ferment*, 1918, *Looking Forward*, 1932, and numerous other books, essays, and addresses on subjects relating to philosophy, education, government, and international relations.

CARTER, BOAKE (1898-). Born in Baku, South Russia; came to America in 1920, naturalized citizen, 1933; educated at Cambridge University; began as newspaper reporter, *Daily Mail*, London; associated with Tulsa (Oklahoma) *World*, Philadelphia *Daily News*, and other newspapers until 1932; since 1932 has been an outstanding radio news commentator.

COUGHLIN, CHARLES EDWARD (1891-). Born in Hamilton, Canada; honor graduate of the University of Toronto, 1911; LL. D. from Notre Dame University, 1933; was ordained priest in 1916; taught philosophy at Assumption College, Western University, 1916-1922; has been since 1926 pastor of the Shrine of the Little Flower, Royal Oak (Detroit), Michigan; organized the National Union for Social Justice; author of *Christ or the Red Serpent*, 1930, *By the Sweat of thy Brow*, 1931; widely known for his radio addresses on communism and labor conditions.

DEWEY, THOMAS (1902-). Born in Owosso, Michigan; A.B., University of Michigan, 1923; LL. B., Columbia, 1925; began practicing law in New York City in 1926; special assistant to United States Attorney General, 1934-35; special prosecutor Racket and Vice Investigation, New York, since 1935.

FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON, (1878-). Born in Buffalo, New York; A.B., Colgate, 1900, D.D., 1914, B.D., Union Theological Seminary, 1904; A.M., Columbia 1908, honorary degrees from New York University, Brown University, Glasgow (Scotland) University, and other institutions; was ordained to the Baptist ministry in 1903; instructor of homiletics, 1908-1915, professor of practical theology

since 1915, Union Theological Seminary; pastor of Riverside Church, New York City; author of *Christianity and Progress*, 1922, *As I See Religion*, 1932, and numerous other books of a religious nature.

HOOVER, HERBERT CLARK, (1874-). Born in West Branch, Iowa; A.B. in engineering, Stanford, 1895, honorary degrees from Brown University, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, Oxford, Prague, and other institutions here and abroad; United States Food Administrator, 1917-1919; director of various relief organizations for the war-stricken nations of Europe; appointed Secretary of Commerce in 1921; President of the United States, 1929-1933; author of *American Individualism*, 1922, *The Challenge to Liberty*, 1934, and numerous addresses on government.

HUGHES, CHARLES EVANS (1862-). Born in Glens Falls, New York; A.B., Brown University, 1881, A.M., 1884; LL. B., Columbia, 1884; LL. D. from Brown University, Yale University, Harvard University, and other institutions; Dr. *honoris causa*, University of Brussels and University of Louvain, 1924; practiced law, New York, 1884-1891, 1893-1906; special lecturer on law, Cornell University, 1893-1895; New York Law School, 1893-1895; Governor of New York, 1907-1910; became associate justice of United States Supreme Court, 1910; Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, 1916; appointed chief justice of the United States Supreme Court, 1930; author of *The Pathway of Peace, and Other Addresses*, 1925, *Pan-American Peace Plans* (Yale University lectures), 1929, and other books on jurisprudence, government, and foreign relations.

HUTCHINS, ROBERT MAYNARD (1899-). Born in Brooklyn, New York; A.B., Yale, 1921, honorary A.M., 1922, LL. B., 1925; LL. D. From West Virginia University, Lafayette College, and other institutions; Dean of Yale Law School, 1928-1929; President of the University of Chicago since 1929.

LA FOLLETTE, ROBERT MARION, JR. (1895-). Born in Madison, Wisconsin; Secretary to Senator Robert M. La Follette for six years; has been United States senator from Wisconsin since 1925.

LIPPMANN, WALTER (1889-). Born in New York City; A.B., Harvard, 1910 (degree taken, 1909); formerly associate editor of *The New Republic*; editor of New York *World* until 1931; now special writer for New York *Herald-Tribune* and other newspapers; author of *Public Opinion*, 1922, *A Preface to Morals*, 1929, *The New Imperative*, 1935, and other books.

NYE, GERALD P. (1892-). Born in Hortonville, Wisconsin; publisher of *The Review*, Hortonville, 1911; manager and editor of *Daily Plain Dealer*, Creston, Iowa, 1915; became editor and manager of Griggs County (North Dakota) *Sentinel-Courier*, 1919; United States Senator from North Dakota since 1925.

ROOSEVELT, FRANKLIN DELANO (1882-). Born in Hyde Park, New York; A.B., Harvard, 1904; attended Columbia University Law School, 1904-1907; honorary degrees from Rutgers, Yale, Notre Dame, and other institutions; began practicing law in New York, 1907; Assistant Secretary of the Navy, 1913-1920; Governor of New York, 1929-1933; has been President of the United States since 1933; author of *Whither Bound*, 1926, *Looking Forward*, 1933, and other books; recognized as one the foremost speakers in America.

THOMAS, NORMAN MATOON (1884-). Born in Marion, Ohio; A.B., Princeton, 1905; B.D., Union Theological Seminary, 1911; ordained minister, 1911; founder and editor of the *World Tomorrow*, 1918-1921; associate editor of *The Nation*, 1921-1922; candidate on Socialist ticket for President of the United States in 1928, 1932 and 1936; author of *America's Way Out—A Program for Democracy*, 1930, *War—No Profit, No Glory, No Need*, 1935, and numerous other expositions of a Socialistic and economic nature.

THOMPSON, DOROTHY (Mrs. Sinclair Lewis), (1894-). Born in Lancaster, New York; A.B., Syracuse University, 1914; graduate study in the University of Vienna; speaker in up-state New York Woman Suffrage Campaign, 1915-1917; foreign correspondent for *Philadelphia Public Ledger* and *New York Evening Post*, 1920-1928; chief of Central European Service, 1924-1928; member of American Academy of Political and Social Science; Author of *The New Russia* and *I Saw Hitler*; columnist and radio commentator; contributor to American and British reviews.

VANDENBERG, ARTHUR HENDRICK (1884-). Born in Grand Rapids, Michigan; studied law at the University of Michigan, 1901-1902; honorary A.M. from University of Michigan, 1925, LL. D. from Hope College, 1926; editor of *Grand Rapids Herald*, 1906-1928; United States Senator from Michigan since 1928; Chairman of Republican Senate Legislative Committee, 1933-1934; member of Author's Club, London, England; author of *Alexander Hamilton, the Greatest American*, 1921, *If Hamilton Were Here Today*, 1933, *The Trail of a Tradition*, 1925.

WALLACE, HENRY AGARD (1888-). Born in Adair County, Iowa; B.S., Iowa State College, 1910; honorary M.S. in Agriculture, Iowa State College, 1920; associate editor of *Wallace's Farmer*, 1910-1929, and editor of *Iowa Homestead* and *Wallace's Farmer* (merged) since 1929; Secretary of Agriculture in Cabinet of President Roosevelt since 1933; author of *Agricultural Prices*, 1920, *America Must Choose*, 1934, *Whose Constitution*, 1936, and other books and articles on agricultural and politico-religious subjects.

YOUNG, OWEN D. (1874-). Born in Van Hornesville, New York; A.B., St. Lawrence University, 1894, D.H.L., 1923; LL. B., Boston University, 1896; honorary degrees from Union College, Dartmouth, Harvard, University of California, and other institutions; began law practice, Boston, 1896; Vice-president of General Electric Company

until 1922, Chairman of the Board of Directors since 1922; member of the Board of Directors of several large industrial establishments domestic and foreign; since 1919, has served as chairman or member on various committees and commissions investigating unemployment, business cycles, reparations, and other economic problems; Gold medalist, National Institute of Social Sciences, 1923, and Roosevelt Memorial Association, 1929; Chairman of Phi Beta Kappa Foundation, 1932-1935.

INDEX

- Ackerman, Carl W. *The Role of the Press as a Factor in Public Opinion and Economic Changes*, 198-209; biographical note concerning, 220
- Adams, J. T., quoted, 205
- Agricultural Adjustment Act, philosophy of, 105, invalidation of, 106
- Agriculture, need for cooperation with labor and capital, 148, need for prosperity of, 148; exporting problems of, 156-7; price-fixing in, 157
- Alliance, United States and Great Britain, advantage of, 65; dangers of, 90
- American Foreign Policy*, LaFollette, Robert, 69-79
- American system, Vandenberg on, 42
- America's Town Hall Meeting of the Air, 52
- Analysis, a factor in a good speech, 3
- Armaments, growth of, 70; race for, 83
- Armistice, conditions under, 82
- Anti-Lynching Bill*, Borah, W. E., 17-38
- Anti-lynching bill, contrary to interests of the South, 21, contrary to sound governmental principles, 32; a sectional measure, 18; unenforceable, 35, unnecessary, 18-28
- Austria, German invasion of, 97, not an occasion for war, 98, relation of United States to, 100
- Beard, Charles, 62
- Being Civilized to Death*, Fosdick, Harry E. 210-19
- Berle, A. A., quoted, 191
- Bodily action, a factor in good speaking, 4
- Borah, William E. *Anti-Lynching Bill*, 17-38; biographical note concerning, 220
- Browder, Earl, cited, 72
- Butler, N. M. *Which Way is Progress?* 138-45
- Carr, E. H., quoted, 202
- Carter, Boake, *Germany Takes Austria*, 97-100; biographical note concerning, 221
- Charlemagne, power of, 140
- Civil Service, an agent for protection against personal government, 134
- Civilization, compared with culture, 213-19, definition of, 211, material character of, 213
- Classification of speeches, 5
- Collective security. See Security.
- Communism, age of, 141; reactionary character of, 142
- Community of Interest between Labor, Capital and Agriculture*, Wallace, Henry, 146-62
- Compton, President, quoted, 194
- Congress, subservience of, 127
- Constitution, methods of changing, 41
- Corson, Hiram, quoted, 176
- Coughlin, Charles E. *The Spirit of the Reorganization Bill*, 111-21; biographical note concerning, 221
- Court. See Judiciary; Supreme Court
- Crime, in the United States, 35; in New York City, 165-75
- Crisis, national, 101
- Culture, character of, 213, relation to civilization, 213; relation to religion, 216-17, transfer of, 216
- Czechoslovakia, economic sanctions in, 61
- Debts, government, in Europe, 83
- Delivery, bodily action and, 4; personality and, 4; projection in, 4; voice in, 4
- Democracy, absence of in Britain and France, 57, capacity of, 12; challenge to, 15, danger to in United States, 58, dangers of, 40; effect of war on, 75; failure of in Europe, 104; motives of, 86; record of in the United States, 105
- Democratic party, future of, 109; power of, 102, tasks of, 109-10
- Denny, George V., introductory remarks of, 52-3
- Dewey, Thomas E. *The Inside Story of a Racket*, 163-75; biographical note concerning, 221
- Dickinson, G. Lowes, quoted, 211
- Dictatorships, rise of, 83
- Economic emancipation, need for, 104
- Economic sanctions, failure of, 74; see also Sanctions.
- Economic unity of world, 64, 144-5
- Eden, Anthony, 75
- Education, goals of, 185-9
- Europe, political conditions in, 54, 57-60, 61, 63-7, 69-70, 80-5, 88-93

228 REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES

- Executive Department, growth of powers of, 131; under Hoover, 131; under F. D. Roosevelt, 131; under Wilson, 131; need for curbing powers of, 131-3. *See also* Personal government
- Factory system, philosophy of, 194
- Farms, improvement of economic situation concerning, 154, influence of demand for products of, 150; low wages of laborers on, 154; motives of those who till, 150; productivity of, 150, relation of to capital and labor, 153-62
- Fascism, organization of, 66; rise and progress of, 87, 142
- Fear, national, in Europe, 84
- Federalism, changing balance of power in, 134
- Force, an instrument of civilization, 63
- Forms of support in speech-making, 3
- Fosdick, Harry E. *Being Civilized to Death*, 210-19, biographical note concerning, 221-2
- Fourteenth Amendment, interpretation of, 31
- Freedom of speech, 49
- Germany Takes Austria*, Carter, Boake, 97-100
- Gettysburg, Lincoln's address at, 40, 41; results of battle of, 43; significance of, 39
- Goods, definition of, 185; education an agency for securing, 189, intellectual, 189; methods of attaining, 188-9; order in, 186; proportion in selection of, 186; social and political, 187
- Government, personal, character of, 122; civil service a protection against, 134; Congressional subservency an agent of, 132; Democratic organization a cause of, 126; increase of in America, 123; judiciary bill an agent of, 127
- Grady, H. W. 29-30
- Guffey Coal Act, 106
- Hague, Mayor, alleged power of, 46-7; alleged restraints of on free speech, 49
- "Have" and "have not" nations, 76
- Hoare-Laval agreement, 58
- Hoover, Herbert, *The Protection of Democracy*, 80-96; biographical note concerning, 222
- House Naval Affairs Committee, testimony before, 71
- Housing, research concerning, 195
- Hughes, Charles E. *The Judiciary*, 176-83; biographical note concerning, 222
- Hull, Secretary, 91
- Hutchins, Robert M. *A Philosophy of Life*, 184-9; biographical note concerning, 222
- Huxley, Thomas, quoted, 217
- Individualism, decline of under fascism, 94
- Inside Story of a Racket*, Dewey, Thomas E. 163-75
- Invasion, no danger of, 71
- Investments, proper form of, 77
- Isolation, definition of, 64, failure of, 65
- Jersey City, 46
- Jesus, quoted, 211
- Jews, persecution of, 89
- Johnson, C. S., quoted, 27
- Johnson, G. W., quoted, 23
- Journalism, inaccuracies of, 207
- Judiciary, Federal, accomplishments of leaders of, 177, its work, 177-80; need for independence of, 178; qualifications of judges in, 180
- Judiciary, The*, Hughes, Charles E. 176-83
- Judiciary bill, dangers of, 127-30
- Kidnapping, a permanent problem, 35
- La Follette, Robert, *American Foreign Policy*, 69-79; biographical note concerning, 223
- League of Nations, failure of, 57, 84, weakness of, 89
- Liberalism, relation to fascism and socialism, 94
- Lincoln, quoted, 40, 41
- Lippman, Walter, *Rise of Personal Government in the United States*, 122-37; biographical note concerning, 223
- Lynching, decline of, 22-7; solution of problem of, 36
- Martinelli, Albert, his accomplishments, 170; his colleagues, 170; his powers, 164-7
- Memorial Day Address*, Vandenberg, A. H. 39-44.
- Nations, "Have Not", 63, 76
- Nazi doctrine, philosophy of, 88; reactionary character of, 142; rise of, 87-8
- National Labor Relations Act, weaknesses of, 107
- National Recovery Act, 106
- Negro problem, solution of, 18-38
- Neutrality, argument for, 56
- Neutrality Act, weaknesses of, 61
- New Deal, history of, 105
- New York politics, corruption of, 163-75
- No Democracy Without Civil Liberty*, Thomas, Norman, 43-51

Nye, G. P. *What Does the European Situation Mean to Us?* 54-60, 67-8; biographical note concerning, 223

Optimism, American, 212

Organization, a factor of a good speech, 3

Ortega, *Revolt of the Masses*, 138-9

"Parallel action," 54, 74

Pareto, *Mind and Society*, 138-9

Personal government. See Government, personal.

Persuasion, a factor in good speaking, 3

A Philosophy of Life, Hutchins, Robert M. 184-9

"Planned Economy" of Europe, 84

Presidential power, menace of, 125.

See also Executive department

Production and distribution, 193

Progress, American, 56, 212

Projection, a factor in delivery, 4

Propaganda, for war, 70

Protection, of the United States, 72

Protection of Democracy, The, Hoover, Herbert, 80-96

Psychology of emergency, evils of, 117

Public opinion, business as a factor of, 205-8; government moulding of, 202-4, need for scientific study of, 199; power of in America, 198,

radio and press as agents of, 199, trend of, 200

Quarantine, political and military, 58

Racket, story of in New York, 163-75

Railroad Retirement Act, 106

Reconstruction, problems of, 19, Butler's control of, 20

Reorganization Bill, bad features of, 116; dangers of joint conference vote on, 115, first draft of, 112, later draft of, 113; need for defeat of, 120, proposed amendments of, 113-14; purpose of, 112

Relief credit countries, Hoover's proposal for debt payments by, 91

Ribbentrop, von, 98

Rise of Personal Government in the United States, Lippman, Walter, 122-37

Riverdale, Lord, cited, 196

Role of the Press as a Factor in Public Opinion and Economic Changes, Ackerman, Carl W. 198-209

Roman Empire, decline of, 140

Roosevelt, Franklin D. *Second Inaugural Address*, 11-16; *Victory Dinner Address*, 101-10; quoted, 69, 78, 107, 108; biographical note concerning, 223

Root, Elihu, 144

Sanctions, economic, 75

Schuschnigg, Chancellor, 97-8

Science of Better Living, Young, Owen D. 190-7

Second Inaugural Address, Roosevelt, F. D. 11-16

Security, collective, cost of in 1917, 60; failure of in Spain, 58, need for definition of, 54; past experience with, 55; relation of to defense of status quo, 57

Self-interest of countries, 62

Slosson, Edwin E., quoted, 208

Socialism, failure of, 86-7

South, achievements of, 38

South America, European invasion of, 59

Speech, characteristics of a good, 3-5

Spengler, *Decline of the West*, 138-9

Spirit of the Reorganization Bill, The, Coughlin, Charles E. 111-21

State, an agent for securing goods, 187, laws and educational system of, 187, need for leadership in, 188

States rights, decline of, 135

Supreme Court of the United States, dangers to, 128; decision in the AAA case, 106; Guffey Coal Act case, 106, in the National Recovery Act case, 106; in the Railroad Retirement Act case, 106

Sutherland, George, 178

Thoreau, quoted, 212-13

Thomas, Norman, *No Democracy Without Civil Liberty*, 45-51, denied opportunity to speak in Jersey City, 46, biographical note concerning, 223

Thompson, Dorothy, *What Does the European Situation Mean to Us?* 60-7; biographical note concerning, 224

Trade, international, program for dealing with, 93

Tuskegee Institute, report on lynching, 28

Vandenberg, A. H. *Memorial Day Address*, 39-44, biographical note concerning, 224

Victory Dinner Address, Roosevelt, F. D. 101-10

Voice, importance of in speech-making, 4

Wagner-Van Nuys Bill. See Anti-lynching bill.

Wallace, Henry, *Community of Interest Between Labor, Capital and Agriculture*, 146-62; biographical note concerning, 224

War, cost of, 76, German invasion of Austria not an occasion for, 98; improbability of, 85; propaganda for, 70

230 REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES

Wells, H. G., quoted, 191-2

What does the European situation mean to us? Nyc. G. P. and

Thompson, Dorothy, 52-68

Whitehead, Prof., quoted, 217

Whitman, quoted, 197

Whitney, W. R., quoted, 195

Wilson, Woodrow, 72, 144

World, unification of, 142-3

Young, Owen D. *The Science of Better Living*, 190-7; biographical note concerning, 224-5

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



129 168

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

